





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

THE
WANDERINGS
OF
THE HUMAN INTELLECT;
OR,
A NEW DICTIONARY
OF
THE VARIOUS SECTS
INTO WHICH THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION, IN ANCIENT AND
IN MODERN TIMES, HAS BEEN DIVIDED;
WITH
AN IMPARTIAL DISCUSSION
OF THE MERITS OF THEIR RESPECTIVE CLAIMS TO
ORTHODOXY.
TO WHICH IS PREFIXED,
AN INTRODUCTORY ESSAY
ON UNIVERSAL HISTORY, AS WELL CIVIL AS ECCLESIASTIC,
FROM THE MUCH-ADMIRED HISTORICAL DISCOURSE OF
THE LEARNED DR PLUQUET,
*In front of his valuable Dictionary of all Religions; from which, and
from other equally respectable Sources, the present Work
is chiefly compiled.*

BY THE REV. JOHN BELL.

“Try the Spirits”—I John, iv. 1.

“Prove all things: hold that which is good”—I Thess. v. 21.

NEWCASTLE:

PRINTED BY EDWARD WALKER, PILGRIM-STREET.

SOLD BY MESSRS RIVINGTON, ST PAUL'S CHURCH YARD, BOOKER, NEW BOND-STREET, AND KEATING AND CO. DUKE-STREET, GROSVENOR-SQUARE, LONDON; BELCHER AND SON, AND WILKS, BIRMINGHAM; TODD, YORK; BELL, AND CHARNLEY, NEWCASTLE; SHARROCK, PRESTON; AND SYERS, MANCHESTER.

1814.

THE NEW YORK

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

P R E F A C E.

RELIGIOUS knowledge is, confessedly, of all other sciences, the most important. Important individually to each member of society, and equally important to the well-being of society at large. Whatever, therefore, has a tendency to promote this knowledge, and to widen its diffusion, is certainly entitled to the patronage of the public, and to the notice and, I had almost said, the gratitude too, of individuals. Of this description, the Editor presumes to flatter himself, the compilation now presented to the community will be deemed to partake. In it, moreover, will be found abundant matter to gratify, if not to satiate, a laudable curiosity—in the investigation of the various principles, as well moral as religious, of our fellow mortals,—and in ascertaining, in many instances, the leading causes of those astonishing revolutions in church or state, that have contributed to diversify each epoch of profane or ecclesiastic history. It does not, indeed, possess the merit of originality; but the method, as far as the Editor has been enabled to discover, is novel to the English press, and calculated, in his judgment, to improve and interest the generality of

his readers. It is needless to premise, that he has no pretensions to infallibility : consequently, he acknowledges himself liable to oversights, and sometimes too, perhaps, to defective reasoning. This he leaves to the enlightened public to discriminate : but as he is conscious he has done his best, he will not pledge himself to do away the supercilious exceptions of illiberal and self-conceited critics ; of whose infallibility he thinks no better than of his own. If the *tout ensemble* of this performance will not furnish adequate materials to answer their objections in a religious view, and to operate conviction on their minds, he owns himself unequal to the arduous task, and, not to fatigue the attention of the reader with unmeaning verbiage—*Verbum non amplius addet.*

He will only request permission just to observe, that the advantages of an alphabetical arrangement of the respective articles constituting this work, are too obvious to require a detail ; and will leave it to its fate—without further comment on its utility or merit. The historical analysis prefixed—must, likewise, be content to speak its own panegyric.

EPITOME OF UNIVERSAL HISTORY.

IN TWO PARTS.

PART I.

Embraces a period of full four thousand years, from the creation of man to the establishment of christianity by Christ our Lord.

CHAPTER I.

Of the antediluvian state of mankind.

ANCIENT Atheistical writers have pretended that men, like mushrooms, sprang spontaneously from the earth, and owed their origin to chance; while modern materialists very gravely inform us, that their primordial existence was a necessary effect of we know not what mysterious arrangement in their beloved chaos; and some learned naturalists have as wisely calculated and ascertained the different epochs, wherein the primeval elements of nature severally concurred in the formation of the universe,—without, however, condescending to acquaint us—by what mysterious influence mankind, or the animal species, or the vegetable world, could start forth from a globe of chrystal, all on fire (no matter how) from eternity. Certainly these gentlemen have each of them the merit of eccentricity. But their sublime theories will not bear the light; they quickly disappear when confronted with the simple and unaffected narrative of the sacred historiographer of the book of Genesis. *In the beginning God created heaven and earth. He said, let light be made, and light was made. And again he said: let us make man to our own image and likeness; and God created man to his own image.* By these few words we learn our origin; what we owe to God and to ourselves, and what we are to hope from the bounty of our great Creator.

Is then God corporeal like man, as the Marcionites of old, the Manichees, the philosophers of the fourth age, and the infidels of the eighteenth, with those of the present day, erroneously infer? By no means: the principal and the most noble part of man is the soul. This soul is gifted with understanding,—with a will and memory, and liberty of action; is capable of knowing, of loving, and adoring her Creator. In this it is, that man is like to God.

Another fruitful subject of profane cavil and irreligious witticism, unworthy any serious reply, are the circumstances which, according to holy scripture, attended the formation of the female. We will just observe, that these very circumstances teach mankind a lesson of the highest importance to their welfare. God would thus remind the female of the superiority of man, since she was formed of him; and man, of that tender affection which he was bound to cherish for one who constitutes a part of his own substance: and both the one and the other, of their obligation mutually to preserve the strictest union, on which alike depends their own well-being, and that of their posterity.

What then would be the state of these two creatures at the moment of their production; what their felicity before they forfeited their innocence; and what would have been their future destiny and that of their posterity, had neither the one nor the other of them fallen into sin? These are queries very interesting, but concerning which holy scripture has explained itself with much reserve. It informs us that God created man *in righteousness and in justice*, (Eccles. c. vii. v. 30. Ephes. c. iv. v. 24); consequently, not merely exempt from vice, but endowed, moreover, with sanctifying grace, which rendered him agreeable in the eyes of his Divine Majesty. It informs us too, that man was created *immortal*, at least in this sense, that he had it in his power to escape death by avoiding sin; death having entered into the world *by sin only*, and *the malice of the devil*, (Rom. c. v. v. 12. Wisd. c. ii. v. 24.) We are likewise given to understand (Ecclus. c. xvii. v. 6.) that God had been pleased to communicate to our first parents *the science of the spirit*. *He filled their heart with wisdom and shewed them both good and evil*. Hence it follows that the state of the first man, previous to his fall, was a state of great felicity, although his happiness was not complete, in as much as he was liable to forfeit by disobedience that original justice in which he was created, together with all the gifts and privileges annexed to it. A more consummate beatitude was destined to be the fruit of his voluntary and unnecessary perseverance in good. How long this probationary state of our first parent might have continued, in order to his perfect confirmation in justice and inamissibility of grace, the Holy Spirit has not thought good to reveal to men. Had he perse-

were in fact, his offspring would have enjoyed the prerogative of original justice in which he was himself created ; each individual of his posterity, would perhaps, like him have been subjected to temporary laws, exposed to the danger of violating them, and of forfeiting as he did, all the privileges of innocence. This is the opinion of the learned Estius, and of the great St Augustine, l. 2. Sentent. Dist. 20, §. 5.

On a variety of other questions regarding which holy scripture is silent, let us beware of imitating the rash curiosity of our proto-parent Adam ; nor presumptuously approach the tree of knowledge in quest of a forbidden fruit. But, why, cries modern incredulity with the ancient Manichees,—why impose a law on man, and lay on him an injunction which God foresaw that he would disobey ? I answer : because man being created a free agent, he had it at his option to obey, and strictly *owed* obedience to his great Creator. It is by free will, as much as by his understanding, that he is distinguished from the brute : and Almighty God most justly required of him a testimony of submission, in acknowledgment of the benefit of life, and other blessings conferred upon him ; and in conformity with the universally established dispensations of Providence it is expedient, that the perfect happiness of his creatures should not be a gift in all respects absolutely gratuitous, but a recompence too, awarded to obedience and virtue. Nor ought the foresight which God had of the prevarication of Adam, in any wise to derogate from this eternal and infinitely wise and equitable dispensation.

When infidels also take offence, that God should have prohibited the eating of the fruit which was to impart the knowledge of good and evil, they affect—not to understand what kind of knowledge is here in question. Adam possessed already the knowledge of *moral* good and evil, as we learn from sacred writ, (Eccles. c. xvii. v. 6.) He would else have been as incapable of sinning, as the infant that has not yet attained the use of reason. But he had not the knowledge of *physical* evil, which he had never yet experienced. He had no idea of that confusion and remorse attendant upon guilt. After his sin he was made sensible of both, and was thus enabled to compare—happiness with misery and grief : such was the experimental *knowledge*, from which Almighty God in his goodness was wishful to preserve him. In this sense alone could the eating of the forbidden fruit communicate to man *the knowledge of good and evil*.

Nor was it inconsistent with justice in Almighty God to make Adam the arbiter of the fate of his posterity. It is the natural condition of humanity ; and such too, is the general order established in every political society. A father, by his personal bad conduct, may reduce to a state of wretchedness whole generations of his offspring. He has it in his power, by the perpetration of a single crime, to entail disgrace upon them

all; and, where slavery is permitted by the law of the land, by bartering his own liberty, to condemn his innocent posterity to servitude. The good of society at large often seems to require such economy, in order thus to inspire parents with a greater horror of crimes—so big with fatal consequences to the interests of their children; and children, in their turn, with gratitude to a parent, who, by his irreproachable demeanour, has placed them beyond the reach of such vexatious circumstances.

The sacred historian has again incurred the jeering sarcasms of profane cavillers—in relating how Eve was tempted, and the melancholy result of her prevarication. To these wise speculatists, the narrative appears, in many instances, *absurd*. First,—they do not conceive the serpent to be more sagacious than the rest of his fellow-animals, nor how he could enter into *conversation* with Eve, or be said to be *accursed* more than other reptiles like himself.—With respect to the superior sagacity of the serpent, we are not sufficiently acquainted with the serpentian species, to pronounce how far precisely it may extend: the extraordinary facts authentically recorded of some other animals, appear at first not less fictitious and incredible. Doubtless, the wicked spirit may have been permitted to converse with Eve through the organ of the serpent; and Eve, very possibly, had not yet experience enough to know whether an animal were naturally capable, or altogether incapable of speech.

That there exists a great variety of this species of creatures, is a fact well known to naturalists, and to travellers: some—winged and extremely beautiful, which, like the feathered race, can waft themselves with great facility through the air. Consequently it is not certain, that some which now crawl upon the ground, did so originally; nor whether the serpent spoken of in the book of Genesis might not belong to the latter class. Again, we are not sure that none among the different species of serpents actually eat earth for their food; were this a fact, it would sufficiently verify the malediction pronounced against that species for tempting Eve to sin.

A thousand other idle exceptions might be started against the authority of the word of God, which merit no reply. But then, was not the chastisement of Adam's disobedience too severe? We can only here remark, that it is absurd to judge of the grievousness of a fault by any other criterion than by the greatness of its punishment on the part of God. Besides, the miseries of this life, and even concupiscence itself, are appendages of our very nature: the exemption from death; the perfect subordination of the flesh to the spirit, were privileges by no means due to our first parents; and of course Almighty God, with perfect justice, could deprive them and their pos-

terity of these prerogatives, in consequence of their guilt. Nor is it *an article of faith*, that infants who have died under the guilt of original sin are doomed to suffer torments in the world to come. They will not enter, it is true, into the kingdom of God; (John iii. 5.) but we are not informed by holy writ whether or not they shall be destined to a place of punishment. This is a point left undecided by the church. Our personal crimes indeed, will subject us to the most dreadful chastisement; but then these are voluntary and by our free choice, and not entailed on us by Adam. Finally, when we speak of Adam's fall, and the punishment which followed his transgression, we must not lose sight of the glorious reparation made by our divine Redeemer Jesus Christ. The fathers of the church here remind us in the first place, that the promise of a Redeemer was as ancient as the fall of man. Previously to his condemnation to sufferings and to death, Almighty God had pronounced already his maledictions against the serpent, and had said to him—*the seed of the woman shall bruise thy head*. In virtue of this promise, say the holy fathers, and of the merits of the Redeemer, Adam and his posterity were sentenced only to a temporary punishment; and thus did the future redemption begin to operate its effect from the very instant it was first announced. They represent to us in the second place, that sufferings and death are the expiation of sin, and a subject of merit through the passion of our Divine Saviour; whence they conclude that, under this view, even the condemnation of man was an act of clemency on the part of God; Jesus Christ, according to the apostle, having converted the bitterness of death into a subject of real triumph, in the assured prospect of a glorious resurrection unto life—with Him, and after his divine example. (1 Cor. xv. v. 54, 55.)

They observe, moreover, that the grace so plentifully diffused by Jesus Christ renders us victorious over our concupiscence; that by this conflict virtue becomes more meritorious, and is made worthy of a recompence equal with that originally designed for our first parents. By so many different considerations do the ancient fathers make us understand—the high dignity to which our nature has been elevated by its union with the divine Word. The greatness of the evil of sin they endeavour to demonstrate—by the powerfulness of the antidote deemed necessary in order to its cure.

According to sacred writ, Adam's penitential course was very long: he lived nine hundred and thirty years, (Gen. c. v. v. 5.) This long life Almighty God was pleased to grant him, in order the more easily to perpetuate among his descendants, the tradition of those grand truths to which he himself was qualified to give the strongest attestation, as having received them personally from his Maker: and could mankind desire an instructor more vene-

nable, or more worthy their attention? But—without that promise of his merciful Creator, respecting the Redeemer to be revealed in future ages, Adam must oft have been exposed to the temptation of despair, upon witnessing the frightful evils of every description, which his sin had unfortunately entailed upon mankind. None, however, among the fathers of the church, have ever entertained a doubt of his salvation: all without exception were persuaded, that this inestimable blessing was secured to him by our common mediator Jesus Christ.

But, not to exceed too much our intended brevity by indulging in theological discussion, we will now simply recapitulate the recital of that most ancient and divinely inspired writer Moses. This venerable historian informs us, that an All-Powerful Intelligence created heaven and earth, and all things which they contain; and that this Supreme Being enlightened man, became his legislator, and proposed to him rewards and punishments of his good or evil actions. He tells us, that unhappy man transgressed the laws which had been thus enjoined him; relates the dreadful sentence denounced against him by the Almighty, and entailed upon the entire human race individually; recounts the disorders of his late posterity; and the severe chastisement of their irregularities by the universal flood, which engulfed the whole earth beneath its raging billows, and overwhelmed in one vast ruin all the inhabitants of the globe, with the exception only, of faithful Noe and his family. This sad catastrophe took place in the year of the creation 1656. For a more detailed account we beg leave to refer our readers to the book of Genesis.

CHAPTER II.

Of the restoration of the human race after the universal flood.

SCARCELY had the waters of the universal deluge well subsided, when again *all flesh* began to *corrupt its ways*. Already the Chaldeans, like almost every other nation of the earth, had abandoned themselves to idol worship, before the lapse of four hundred and twenty-six years from the flood, when Almighty God caused Abraham to quit his native country, and to fix his residence in the land of Canaan. Here, he was pleased to make a covenant or *alliance* with this patriarch, by which he promised to give to his posterity the territory he then inhabited; and this same promise he confirmed to Isaac and to Jacob, Abraham's son and grandson. (Gen. xii. Deut. vi.)

A series of events, directed by the hand of Providence, conducted Jacob and his family into Egypt, where the patriarch, on his death-bed, predicted to his children their various des-

tinies in future ages ; announced the distant coming of the great Messiah ; marked his distinctive characters, and declared that the sceptre should not depart from the tribe of Juda, until this promised Saviour of mankind should come to dwell amongst us.

CHAPTER III.

The miraculous deliverance of the Hebrew people from their Egyptian bondage, and the promulgation of the decalogue.

IN Egypt, the children of Jacob multiplied exceedingly ; till the jealousy of that idolatrous people reduced them to a state of the most cruel bondage. To effect their deliverance, Almighty God employed the most stupendous miracles. He became himself their law-giver, and reconducted them, as it were by the hand, into the land of promise. Here the Hebrew people formed a society, which had no resemblance nor connection with any other nation of the globe,—to render to the Supreme Being a true and legitimate worship, grounded upon the following principles:—

There is but one only God, who created heaven and earth, and who governeth all things by his providence : he alone is worthy of our love ; he alone, above all other objects, is to be revered, and his holy name held in supreme veneration. He beholdeth all things, even the inmost secrets of the heart : he is good, and merciful, and just. Man he hath created in a state of liberty, and hath left to him the free and un-necessitated choice of good or evil. It is the duty of man to receive with gratitude, all kinds of blessings, as coming from the hand of God ; and all calamities with submission, as paternal chastisements, or as certain tests of his fidelity. But, although Almighty God is merciful and good, the Hebrew people must not flatter themselves with the hopes of impunity, or of seeing an end of the evils brought upon them by their disorders, without a sincere sorrow for their crimes.

Such was the religion, such the sublime morality of the Jewish nation ; a people without arts or sciences, and in every other respect ignorant and rude ; while the most polished nations of the universe, with all their boasted skill in literature and the polite arts, lay engulfed in impenetrable darkness, as to the existence and the nature of a Supreme Being, the true origin of things, and the destiny of man !

To the most exalted ideas, the Hebrew people joined hopes the most magnificent and elevated. They were taught to believe, that—of the tribe and family of King David, would be born a Saviour, destined to deliver them from all their evils, and to

bring the entire human race to the knowledge of the true and living God. (Gen. xlix. v. 10. Kings 2. c. vii. v. 12. Ps. xxi. v. Is. xi. 8. 10. Ezech. xxxiv. v. 23.)

The religion, however, of this cherished nation, did not consist in the bare profession of these grand truths; it had its peculiar rites, its ceremonies, and its sacrifices; its holocausts, purifications and expiatory observances. It prescribed laws admirably calculated to promote social intercourse, and the happiness of the people: in a word, every thing in church and state was here divine, because the Deity himself was the immediate author—not less of their political, than he was of their religious institutions. The observance of the laws which God had prescribed, was followed with sensible and speedy recompence, besides the consoling prospect of future reward in a better world. At the head of the church presided a sovereign pontiff, whose lips were the repositories of wisdom and truth; before his breast were suspended the *Urim* and the *Thurim*, through the medium of which Almighty God thought fit to deliver his sacred oracles to men.

The Jewish nation, enclosed within its mountains, and precluded from every species of connection with idolaters by its legislative code, seemed destined to preserve its religion unaltered and unimpaired: every thing that could bear reference to religion, to morality, to social life,—was carefully inculcated to the people from their infancy, and diligently explained by the prophets or the Levites, each Sabbath day, and on all the solemn festivals: a frightful portrait was depicted on these occasions, of the mythology of other nations; and they were prohibited, under the severest penalties, to receive from them their education in polite literature and the sciences. Their place of worship was confined to one single city, and to one temple only, which was the common centre of religion. The uninterrupted succession of the priesthood; the continual attention of the ministers in their various sacrifices of victims; the general obligation imposed upon all—of offering their children in the temple, and of attending there personally every year, in order to their purification, were means well adapted to perpetuate among the Jews the religion of their ancestors. All these precautions, however, proved insufficient to prevent its corruption; and at Jerusalem itself were seen idolatrous kings, and even the very ministers of God, profaning the temple and religion with the motley worship of false divinities, in conjunction with the Supreme Being.

The Almighty, thus provoked, withdraws his protection from this infidel race; and Jerusalem falls a prey to the Assyrians. The furious conquerors dismantle the city, level its venerable temple with the ground, and lead away the captive Jews to Babylon. After a long and tedious captivity, they are suffered to return, and to re-build their city and their temple. When Alexander the Great had conquered Asia, vast numbers of the Jews passed

into Egypt, and settled at Alexandria under this conqueror and his successors, who granted them the privileges enjoyed by the Macedonians, and the unrestricted exercise of their own religion.

Length of time insensibly unbraced those ties which had attached the Jewish people to their country, and gradually enfeebled their respect for the law of Moses, and their aversion for infidelity. *There went out of Israel wicked men; and they persuaded many; saying: Let us go and make a covenant with the heathens that are round about us: for since we departed from them, many evils have befallen us. And the word seemed good in their eyes. And some from among the people went to the king: and he gave them licence to live after the manner of the heathens. And they built a place of exercise at Jerusalem, according to the custom of the gentiles.*

The priests themselves were not now occupied about the offices of the altar; but despising the temple, and neglecting the sacrifices, they hastened to be partakers of the public shows; contemning what was most honourable with their fathers. (l. 1. c. 1. Mach.)

In a word, to such a height of frenzy did they carry their impiety, that they affected in all things to imitate the infidels, and to resemble in their whole demeanour the mortal enemies of their country and religion. (Ibid. v. 16.)

CHAPTER IV.

Of the various sects into which the Jewish people were, in latter times, divided.

FROM this degrading epoch, the Jews began to fritter into sects. The Pharisees maintained, that Almighty God, in addition to the law given on Mount Sinai, had prescribed an infinite number of rites and dogmas, which Moses had transmitted to posterity without committing them to writing; and, along with such traditions as were true, they intermingled a variety of ridiculous fables, false notions, and erroneous principles, borrowed from the equally fallacious maxims of pagan philosophy. Thus they corrupted the doctrine of the law. Josephus the historian informs us, that they ascribed all contingencies to an over-ruling destiny, although, at the same time, they very inconsistently allowed free will to man; because, said they, such had been the divine pleasure. They left to him the uncontrolled election of virtue, or of vice, still maintaining that all things happen in consequence of some necessitating decree or dispensation of the Supreme Being. They held, that the souls of the wicked, after death, were confined in dungeons, and that they suffered eternal punishment; while those of the good were

restored to life, and entered into bodies, different from those which they had animated heretofore. It would be endless to detail, in full, all their visionary traditions: they are the subject of no less than two and thirty volumes in folio, which compose what is called the Talmud.

In the Talmud are distinguished seven different orders of Pharisees. One of these orders, in their obedience to the law, had in view only worldly profit and earthly glory: another made perfection to consist in dragging their feet along the ground in the act of walking; a third, in beating violently their heads against a wall, so as to stain it with their blood; a fourth, in wearing a hood upon their head; a fifth, in crying out with much ostentation, 'show me what I am to do, and I will do it; or rather what is there that I have not done already'? The sixth order observed the law through a love of virtue and hope of recompence; but the seventh, for fear of punishment and the wrath of God.

All of them recited long prayers, and refused themselves even necessary repose. They hung their head as they walked along, fearing lest otherwise they should touch the feet of the Divinity, which they superstitiously imagined not more than four feet elevated above the ground; and, in order to appear in the eyes of the people solely occupied with the things above, they sewed to their garments the *philacteria* or fillets, on which were written certain sentences of the law, wore by them in order to distinguish them from the vulgar Jews. They practised more frequent ablations than their neighbours, to show their extreme desire of perfect purity. Their zeal for proselytism was ardent and indefatigable; and this zeal, added to the severity of their mortifications, gave the people a high idea of their sanctity: the denomination of sage was appropriated to them by way of excellence. They kept their disciples in a kind of subjection little short of servitude, and regulated every thing appertaining to religion with absolute authority. Boundless was their influence over the minds of the populace, and of the female kind; and they put in motion at their pleasure the stormy billows of popular insurrection, and became formidable even to their kings. Such were the men censured with peculiar severity in the gospels by our blessed Saviour Jesus Christ.

The Sadducees, in the opposite extreme, rejected the traditions of the ancients, and, like our modern Caraites, would abide by nothing but the *written word*. In unison with this principle, they expounded the books of Moses according to their strict and literal acceptance; believed that the universe was the work of the Almighty, and that he continues to govern it by his providence; that he had wrought an infinite number of prodigies in favour of the Hebrew people, and in establishing its police had decreed rewards and punishments: but these penalties and these

recompences they believed to be purely temporal, and confined within the limits of the present life. These Jews, strictly attached to the bare letter of the law, could discover nothing in the writings of Moses, which taught in express terms, that the soul would survive the dissolution of the body; and, as they were enemies to all traditionary doctrine, they of course denied the immortality of the soul. This error of the Sadducees was not, perhaps, universally maintained by all who affected to adhere to the letter of the law: although their implacable enemies the Pharisees, imputed it to the entire sect without exception, in order to render them the more odious, or, it may be, because they deemed it a consequence naturally flowing from their principles relative to tradition: a consequence, however, which, very possibly, all the Caraites would not so easily admit.

A third sect among the Jews was that of the Essenians. These respected Moses as the first of legislators: they considered all who spoke ill of him as blasphemers, and sentenced them to die. They differed from the Pharisees, in rejecting their traditions; and from the Sadducees, in maintaining the immortality of the soul. This sublime doctrine, so essential to the happiness of man, had engrossed the whole attention of the Essenians: it constituted a part of the Jewish religion; and they sought to give to it the last degree of evidence, by argument, and by examining into the nature of the properties of a human soul, with a view both to convince themselves more strongly of this truth, and to enable them with greater ease to answer the objections of the Sadducees, who seemed to have adopted the principles of Epicurism. Stoicism, on the contrary, offered purer charms to the Essenians. According to the morality of this philosophic sect, they concluded, that whatever was calculated to flatter the senses; whatever served to inflame the passions,—increased the slavery of the soul. Full of these impressions, they abandoned the tumultuous scenes of public life, in order more effectually to secure themselves against that corruption which generally prevails in towns, and communicates its baneful infection to the inhabitants, as epidemic disorders are propagated among those that breathe an impested air. In their retirement they formed a society apart; amassed neither gold nor silver; and, content with simple necessities, they subsisted by the labour of their hands.

They applied much to the study of morality; and their precepts all bore reference to the love of God, of virtue, and their neighbour. Of their love of God, Philo says, they gave unnumbered proofs: they observed perpetual and unsullied chastity through life. On no occasion did they swear, and never were detected in a lie. All good they ascribed to God; and they shuddered at the idea of making Him the author of evil. They demonstrated to all that knew them, their sincere love of vir-

tue,—by their noble disinterestedness of conduct ;—by their contempt of glory and ambition, their renunciation of pleasure, their patience and amiable simplicity ;—by their habitual cheerfulness and contentment, their modesty, their respect for the laws, and their firmness and evenness of mind on all occasions. Their love of their neighbour was apparent, from their glowing charity, their affability towards all mankind, their having every thing in common, and their great humanity. According to the Essenians, nature, like a common mother, brought forth and nurtured all men in the same manner, and had made them all truly brethren : concupiscence had dissolved this natural relationship ; and it was their ambition to revive it. In so favourable a light did Philo consider the Essenians ; and certainly, if the picture be pourtrayed with accuracy, who will deny their virtues to have been angelic, and their moral sanctity most deserving of admiration ? May not we then hope well of their salvation ; and that, although their errors were considerable, they were only the mistakes of human infirmity, and not the offspring of self-conceit and pride ?

The Essenians established various confraternities in Palestine ; and all things with them were in common. They were, moreover, interspersed among the Jews, wherever that people had made any settlements, especially in Syria and in Egypt. In this latter country in particular, near the lake Moria, on an eminence above the reach of hostile incursion, and eligible for its salubrious air, each one had a small oratory, which they called a monastery : there they had no other furniture than the writings of Moses, and of the prophets, together with a collection of some hymns, and a few other pious books. At the dawning of the day, they implored the divine blessing ;—that true and inestimable blessing which illumines and inflames the soul. At the setting of the sun they prayed that their spirits, unincumbered by the senses and sensual objects, might be qualified in perfect recollection to discern the truth. The remainder of the day they employed in the study of the holy scriptures : the text they regarded as a symbol under which lay concealed the most sublime, and the most important truths.

They neither eat nor drank before sunset ; and some among them, quite absorpt in contemplation, forgot for three whole days to take their usual nourishment. Six days successively they passed in their oratory, without so much as looking out at their door. On the seventh day, they were accustomed to assemble at a common oratory, where one of the most learned of their body delivered a discourse, after which they took together their frugal repast of bread and salt. During the repast was observed a profound silence : as soon as it was over, one of the company proposed a question concerning certain passages of holy scripture ; another undertook to answer, and the president was

to decide—whether the query were duly solved, then added what he thought fit upon the subject; when all present expressed their approbation, and rose to chaunt a hymn of thanksgiving and praise. The rest of the day was consumed in religious conferences, and the night in sacred psalmody until the rising of the sun.

The Essenians refused to hold communion with the Jews, because they deemed them not sufficiently perfect: they immolated no victims, and partook not of the sacrifices offered in the temple.

To the abovementioned sects we may add, that of the Samaritans. The ancient kingdom of Samaria was inhabited by the ten tribes of Israel, severed from the kingdom of Jerusalem under Roboam, son of Solomon, by the enterprising and not less impious Jeroboam. Eventually, Salmanasar, king of the Assyrians, made himself master of Samaria, transported its inhabitants into the plains of Chaldea, and sent a colony of Cutheans to repeople Samaria. This colony, we are informed in holy writ, was devoured by lions, because it had presumed to introduce into the holy land its heathenish divinities. Esharaddon sent thither a new colony, under the conduct of a Jewish priest, who had orders to re-establish there the ancient worship. But this priest could not prevail with the new inhabitants to abandon altogether their former superstition; and they made up a medley of their own religion with that of the old Samaritans; till they finally embraced the Jewish worship, and were called proselytes of the *Lions*, to intimate that it was the dread of these furious animals, which had effected their conversion to the Jewish religion, though not in *all* its purity. For,

In the first place, among all the writings considered by the Jews as canonical, they received the Pentateuch only, or the five books of Moses.

2. They offered sacrifice on Mount Garisim and not at Jerusalem; alleging, that they wished to conform to the worship of the patriarchs who preceded Moses.

3. They looked for a Messiah, like the Jews; and believed that this Messiah was destined not only to be a king, but a teacher too, sent from God to enlighten and instruct them.

4. They observed the law of Moses with great exactitude, and had not, in other instances, less respect for the Pentateuch than the Jews themselves; although their obedience to the law was not proof against the terrors of persecution and the dread of torments.

5. The Samaritans rejected all tradition, and adhered only to the written word. As in this they agreed with the Sadducees, the Jews imputed to them, though wrongfully, the error of that sect with reference to the immortality of the soul.

When the Ptolomies had possessed themselves of Judea and

Samaria, the Samaritans like the Jews, established themselves in Egypt. Like them they contracted an inclination for philosophy and the sciences; particularly for the Platonic philosophy joined with the Chaldaic, which consisted principally in the art of producing certain marvellous effects by the hidden virtues of plants, by the delusions of astrology, and the superstitious invocation of the genii. Some among the Samaritans had blended this kind of philosophy with the dogmas of their religion: and in Samaria were to be found certain magicians who pretended an immediate mission from Almighty God, and seduced the people by their false miracles. The histories of Dositheus and of Simon the magician, establish this fact beyond dispute.

The East had been the original nursery of mankind; there the arts and sciences were first invented and duly fostered; there, cities were first built, states and empires formed, at a period when the Western hemisphere was inhabited by simple shepherds, or, in many instances, by savage hordes of rude barbarians. Wars, excessive population, and a variety of contingencies, compelled the adventurous among polished nations, to leave their original settlements, and to sail in quest of new abodes. These colonies formed different establishments in maritime countries, and particularly in Italy; softened the manners of the barbarous people among whom they settled, and organized a number of small independent states, which had each their peculiar laws, religious usages and customs, and were much exposed, from their local situation, to frequent wars. Thus, while ease and luxury had corrupted and enfeebled the nations of the East, the contrary habits enured, in a corner of the West, a hardy race of men to the toils and dangers of almost perpetual warfare, and the enterprise of free booty. To characters of this description, imperial Rome owed its origin and its grandeur. At its birth it resembled a kind of open plain, inhabited by a set of warriors or marauders, drawn together by the prospect of plunder, and, not unfrequently, by the hopes of impunity for their crimes. The excellence of its original constitution, and its advantageous situation, seemed already to prognosticate in its favour the conquest of Italy and Greece, as well as of the East, Spain and Gaul; all which, in effect, it gradually subdued. Almost the whole of the then known world took part in the awful contest between two of its rival citizens, the renowned Julius Cæsar, and Pompey surnamed the Great.

With these conquests were introduced into the republic the vices of the conquered countries; and the love of honour, liberty, and patriotism disappeared. In their place were substituted ambition, and a boundless thirst for riches. Thus every thing in the Roman commonwealth foreboded a revolution; and an absolute monarchy was in fact established by Julius Cæsar. Nor did the efforts of Brutus and Cassius, who deprived him of the

sovereign power together with his life, restore their country to its former liberty. Augustus, triumphing over the assassins and their party, effectually suppressed the spirit of opposition, and governed in peace a mighty empire, extending from the Indian ocean to the Danube.

Augustus was succeeded by Tiberius, a prince still more powerful and more despotic. He lived without reproach as long as he remained in a private capacity, and even at the head of armies, under Augustus: but when no longer restrained by the fear or love of any man, his vices were indulged in defiance of all justice, honor or decorum; and the world had for its ruler a prince, infamous for his shameful irregularities; cruel, avaricious; extremely jealous of his power; suspicious to a degree of frenzy. To his mad jealousy he immolated whole hecatombs of citizens; and to his dark suspicions thousands of innocent people were inhumanly and almost daily sacrificed. Rome was full of informers; and to be virtuous or rich was deemed high treason: none presumed to advocate the cause of the unhappy sufferers, or even to bemoan the dead. The voice of nature was stifled in the general corruption; and a servile fear had silenced every sympathetic murmur. The government of the provinces was confided to the hands of unprincipled and rapacious ministers; men devoid of every virtuous feeling,—without honor, without humanity; who promoted to the dignities of the state other miscreants as wicked as themselves, and disposed at pleasure of the life and fortunes of all within the grasp of their control.

Tiberius named for his successor Caius Caligula. This prince had been educated in the midst of camps. He joined with sovereign power the ferocity of the soldier; a disposition—violent, impetuous and sanguinary; and he associated with none but stage-players and public debauchees. Under this monster the atrocious reign of Tiberius himself appeared desirable; and his murderers were of course applauded by the people. From this period the soldiery conferred, and took away, the imperial dignity at their discretion: the different armies named each their emperor; and the horrors of civil war were added to the vices of the prince, and to that universal corruption which infected the whole body of the empire. The rage of arms continued to spread desolation over the earth until the reign of Trajan.

CHAPTER V.

The origin and progress of idolatry.

THUS had ambition and lawless violence, joined with the impiety of heathenism and superstition, annihilated the very phantom of true virtue, and substituted the most frightful cor-

ruption and degeneracy of morals in its place. The nations of the earth, indeed, had lost the knowledge of the true God at a very early period after the universal flood, and together with it, had forfeited, in great measure, their very reason; may we not add, the privilege too, of common sense: so horribly perverted was their judgment, that there was nothing in the heavens or on earth, nay, even in hell itself, that they did not compliment with divine honours; nothing in nature, whether good or evil, that they deemed not worthy of deification.

The various species of idolatry in general may be classed as follows:—First, the worship of angels and spirits, or pure and abstracted intelligences, who were imagined to preside over provinces and kingdoms; and these in holy scripture are termed Elohim or Gods,—strange Gods, the Gods of the Heathens, &c. concerning which see Exod. xviii. 11. xxii. 19. 2 Kings xvii. 7. Secondly, the worship of the heavenly bodies, the sun, moon, and stars. This in scripture is termed *worshipping the host of heaven*. Thirdly, the worship of idols or statues of various forms and shapes; as of men, beasts, birds, fishes, and the Lord knows what: and this kind of worship was of all the most universally established, and what is most properly called idolatry. Fourthly, the worship of living animals in their own figure: for instance, of lions, tigers, horses, oxen, sheep, swine, goats, dogs and cats, mice, and even spiders; of the eagle, the ibis, phoenix, hawks, and other birds and fowl; the whale, and various kinds of fish, with serpents of every species, and other reptiles; as we read in authentic history. Fifthly, the worship of things inanimate, as fire, water, air, the winds, the earth with all sorts of herbs and plants, stones, and shapeless blocks of marble, &c. Sixthly, the heathen world worshipped not only what had substance, but also the mere modes and accidents of things, as life, death, the passions of love, anger, fear, envy, and the like: diseases, as the fever; also health, honour, fidelity, truth, peace, money and mirth; and, what is still more shameful, impudence, calumny, fraud, fury and discord, with a train of the most vicious propensities of the human heart, were all esteemed divinities, and had temples erected for their impious worship. Seventhly, another branch of idolatry was, the paying of divine honors to kings and heroes who had performed extraordinary feats or exploits, as if they had in them something more than human; and therefore they were adored in quality of Demi-gods. Thus the emperors of China, India, and the Tartars, are worshipped at this day. Lastly, the most impious kind of idolatry of all was, the worshipping of devils and evil spirits, called Caco-Demons. Their wretched votaries, by way of apology, allege, that God is good, and will not hurt them; therefore they need not pray to him: but, say they, the wicked

spirits in the air, as they are inclined and have a power to do mischief, so they most undoubtedly will do it, if not appeased with sacrifices and supplications. Such diabolical adoration is very frequent at this day in the Indies, in America, and in other parts of the yet heathen world.

It is a generally received opinion among the learned, that Ninus, the first Assyrian monarch, was the original author and introducer of idol-worship. With a view to immortalize the name and memory of his father Belus, the same with the famous Nimrod mentioned in holy scripture, he impiously caused a statue representing him, to be adored by his infatuated subjects; and the more easily to induce them to it, he declared the temple in which it stood, a sanctuary or asylum for the guilty and the oppressed. The contagion quickly spread from the Assyrians and Chaldees to the neighbouring nations, to the Egyptians, the Ethiopians, the Syrians, the Phœnicians, the Persians, Grecians and Indians, the latter of whom have been ever since obstinately addicted to the worship of false Gods; and the secret of deification being thus early discovered, the heathen world, with inconceivable stupidity, multiplied their divinities without end or measure, according as their silly fancies, or the evil spirit that beguiled them, happened to suggest.

PART II.

Comprehends the whole intermediate period from the coming of our Redeemer in the flesh, to the sixteenth century, or the famous epoch of the reformation.

First century of the christian era.

SUCH was the dark reign of superstition and of all iniquity, at the period of which we have just spoken! The time was now elapsed, which had been so distinctly marked by the ancient prophets for the coming of the Messiah; and the Jews, groaning under the pressure of a foreign yoke, and the tyranny of Herod whom Augustus had confirmed in the usurpation of the Jewish sceptre, were eagerly expecting their promised Redeemer. The Roman empire was just beginning to enjoy a profound peace, when this divine Saviour appeared upon our earth—with all the characteristics necessary to distinguish him, and to make him

known to mortals. But the Jews, under the erroneous persuasion that their Messiah was destined to be a famous conqueror, would not recognise him in the person of Jesus Christ, and fancied they had found him under the guise of certain fanatics who called themselves Messiah and kings of Israel, and excited the people to sedition and revolt. (Joseph. Antiq. l. 17, c. 12; de Bell. l. 2, c. 4, 5, 6.)

To discharge the functions of his sacred ministry, our blessed Redeemer traverses Judea, and discovers to the Jews the whole extent of the corruption of lost man. He announces to them the unity of the Godhead in three persons, and assures them that he himself is one of these divine persons, made man in order to redeem mankind. He declares to them their religious obligations to this most blessed Trinity, and promises to all that shall believe his doctrine and practise his laws, not a temporary reward as the Jews expected, but a spiritual and eternal recompence; a felicity unaltered and which knows no end. Universal benevolence, simplicity of heart, a tender condescension and compassion towards our fellow creatures; the pardon of injuries, and the love of our very enemies themselves, together with an inviolable attachment to truth, are duties which he exacts from us all, in our mutual intercourse with each other. In regard of God, he enjoins a worship tempered with love,—with filial respect,—with a certain reverential fear, and with divine hope. He then institutes his sacraments, to procure for men the succours necessary to enable them to comply with their duty; proves the divinity of his mission, and the truth of his doctrine by incontestible miracles; commissions his apostles to preach his doctrine over the whole earth; consummates his course among mortals by dying upon the cross; rises from death by the efficacy of his own power, and ascends all-glorious into heaven.

The progress of christianity; the preaching of the apostles; the miracles wrought by them, and even the very virtues practised by the community of the faithful, inflame the hatred of the Jews to fury, and make them persecute outrageously the church of God. The christians of Jerusalem are dispersed over all Palestine, and throughout all the provinces of the East, in which their countrymen had formed any settlements; and they quickly disseminate their doctrine among the most distant nations of the globe. Some philosophers had already, in their writings, had the courage to attack polytheism; though with much reserve, and without throwing any light upon the origin of man, or his final destination. But never before this extraordinary epoch, had a whole society of men, devoid of education for the most part, and unacquainted with human literature, attempted to explain what the philosophers had in vain endeavoured to account for, concerning the first origin of things, and the nature and destiny of man; or to teach a morality calcu-

lated to establish upon earth universal philanthropy, inviolable friendship, uninterrupted peace ;—a morality so pure and sublime, as to place man under the special protection of a Supreme and All-powerful Being, who hateth iniquity, and cherisheth virtue with infinite complacency ;—a Being that rewardeth with never-ending felicity, the reasonable service rendered unto him, and the good offices done to our fellow-creatures for his sake, and our patience and resignation under the evils incident to humanity ; and who punisheth impiety with endless misery ;—impiety, that most unnatural of crimes ; a vice as degrading to man, as it is baneful to the dearest interests of society. This noble morality the christians alone exemplified in their conduct, and chose rather to expire under torments, than to transgress its precepts, or to withhold its doctrines from their fellow men. Miracles and grace seconded their pious efforts ; and a prodigious number of jews and pagans embraced the christian religion.—We will now proceed briefly to examine, what were the heresies which first began to ruffle its tranquillity.

The Messiah was to be recognised by the peculiar characteristics under which the prophets had long before announced him, not less than by the miracles which accompanied his actual appearance among men. Hence certain impostors affected to realize them in their own persons ; while others who could not with the smallest semblance of probability apply them to themselves, denied the authority of the ancient prophets, and combated the doctrine of Jesus Christ by the principles of the philosophers ; vainly attempting to explain consistently with the incoherent theories which they had invented, whatever facts they could not but concede in favor of christianity. Of this description were, for instance,—Simon Magus, Menander and Theodorus.

Others, again, received the doctrine of the apostles, but pretended to reconcile it, sometimes with the Jewish religion ; at other times, with the philosophy of the Chaldees. Such were those christians whom St Paul reproaches for suffering themselves to be deluded with silly *fables and endless genealogies*. Many had recourse to allegorical explanations, to do away whatever did not tally with that system of religion which they had previously adopted for themselves. Thus the Nazareans pretended, like many methodists of the present day, that the apostles had not understood the doctrine of Jesus Christ ; and joined together the code of christianism with the ceremonious observances of the Jews : thus Hymeneus, Alexander, Philetus and Hermogenes, rejected the dogma of the resurrection, because they deemed the union of the soul with the human body a state of degradation which, in their ideas, could not stand with the recompence of virtue.

Grounded upon these principles, some saw nothing in the

christian institute but a system of morality the most excellent in its tendency, capable of elevating man above the dominion of the senses. These carried all its counsels to an extreme, and judged it criminal to be concerned for the nourishment of the body: while others, imagining that the soul is of its own nature incapable of being corrupted by bodily defilement, abandoned themselves without remorse to every kind of sensual indulgence. Some regarded Jesus Christ as one of the genii descended from heaven, who had assumed humanity in outward appearance only, the better to instruct mankind; others believed him to be a man more perfect than the rest of mortals, directed and assisted by a genius from above: of this class were the Nazareans, Cerinthus, the Ebionites, and those whom St Paul reproves for starting questions calculated to cause disputes, rather than to administer edification in faith. (1 ep. ad Tim. 1. 4.)

All these were condemned by the apostles, and separated from their communion as the corruptors of its faith. All of them, however, had their disciples and sectarians, who, like their masters, severally pretended that they taught nothing but the pure doctrines of Christ: and, to justify their pretensions, some maintained that Jesus Christ had delivered a twofold doctrine, the one in public, proportioned to the capacity of the people, and which was contained in the New Testament; the other he had confided to a small number only, of privileged disciples, which was to be understood by none but enlightened men, and which had been transmitted down to them by certain chosen pupils of St Matthew and St Paul. (Iren. advers. hæres. l. 1, c. 25.)

Others there were, who boldly retrenched from the canonical books of the New Testament, whatever ill accorded with their own particular opinions, and fabricated new gospels and epistles, which they ascribed to the apostles, or to Moses, Zoroaster, Noah and Abraham; whose names they affixed to their supposed productions respectively.

All these various sects, abounding with fanatics and enthusiasts, used their utmost efforts to propagate their religious reveries, and succeeded but too well in many provinces of the East.

The Pythagorean philosophers of this age regarded Jesus Christ as a superior being, who presided over the genii or demons by his profounder skill in the magic art; they affected to rival his miracles, and to practise a kind of morality more perfect than that of the christians. Of this number were Apollonius Thyaneus, and his disciples. (Vit. Apol. Thyan.) The Epicurean philosophers, who acknowledged no other divinity in nature than mere matter endowed with eternal motion, rejected without any previous examination whatever they heard reported concerning christianity. The Academics, whose system led them to doubt of every thing, troubled not their heads

about the christian faith. The idolatrous priests and devotees ;— all in a word, who gained their livelihood by the worship of false gods ; architects, musicians, perfumers, statuaries, and sculptors, to a man rose up against the christians ; imputed to them alone every calamity, and every species of wickedness ; and left nothing unattempted to render them the objects of public hatred. Magistrates and politicians, under the erroneous idea that christianity, by the introduction of a new doctrine, must of course disturb the peace of the state, looked upon its professors with a jealous eye. Laws were enacted against them, and executed with the utmost rigour, under the bloody reign of Nero. Galba, Otho and Vitellius, Vespasian and Titus, suspended the persecution, which again broke out with equal fierceness under the tyrant Domitian. The peaceable reign of Nerva was favourable to the christians, as well as to every other description of men. But, in the very worst of times, and in the midst of persecution itself, the church of Christ, founded by the apostles, unalterable in its doctrine, and incorruptible in its morality, had made rapid progress over the whole extent of the Roman empire, while the greatest part of the sects above-mentioned had dwindled to insignificance, and nearly sunk into oblivion. Had the christian religion been an imposture, its progress, and the annihilation of the various sects which attacked it at its very birth, would have been not only an effect without any possible cause, but a fact which took place in defiance of the combined assemblage of every possible cause which ; in the natural course of things, must have prevented it. The learning, the ingenuity, and the malice of its numerous adversaries ; the terrors of persecution, the impenetrable mysteriousness of its doctrines ; its contradiction to every sentiment of flesh and blood, and the want of all the ordinary qualifications requisite in its founders to recommend it to the veneration of mankind, are all of this nature. Among the sectaries who opposed it, many invented systems to explain—in what sense Jesus Christ might be termed the only Son of God. This, then, had been an article of belief taught by Christ, and confirmed by miracles. In fact, the apostles retrenched from the communion of the church, all those who believed that Jesus Christ was merely the most perfect among creatures. Consequently, in the very times of the apostles the faithful believed that Jesus Christ was true God, and from eternity ; and this belief was a fundamental article of christianism. Hence it is most evident, that all the Socinian interpretations of scripture passages relative to the divinity of Jesus Christ, are in direct contradiction to the sense which the apostles affixed to them ; and one solitary instance of a single individual separated by them from the communion of the church, for maintaining that Jesus Christ was only a creature,

and not from eternity, is abundantly sufficient to do away all the boasted comments of the anti-christian school of Socinus.

Second century of the christian æra.

The disorders which prevailed in the Roman empire, inclusively from the reign of Tiberius to that of Domitian, seemed to forebode its speedy dissolution. The choice of a virtuous emperor at this crisis saved it. His reign was truly the commencement of a golden age; and all his moments appeared to be employed in laying the foundations of perpetual prosperity to the empire. He succeeded in reconciling together two things hitherto esteemed absolutely incompatible; the sovereignty of the prince, and the liberty of the subject.

Nerva had relatives, and even children of his own. Nevertheless he adopted for his colleague in the empire, one whose person was to him an utter stranger, save by the fame of his military and social virtues. This was Trajan; under whose reign the power and magnificence of Rome was at its zenith. He caused the laws to be respected within the empire; subdued the Dacii; gave kings to the Parthians; conquered Armenia, the two Arabias, Felix and Petrea, Assyria, and an incredible number of nations, till then unknown. In a word, he traversed and subjected all those immense tracts over which Alexander the Great had heretofore extended his domain. But these barbarians had imbibed a strong aversion for the Roman name; and fear alone prevented them from rising in a mass against their haughty conquerors. Egypt, Arabia and Lybia, were on the eve of insurrection; and the Marcomanni and Sarmatians were actually making inroads into the empire—when Adrian assumed the purple. This prince, though himself a great captain, abandoned all the conquests of his predecessor, and fixed the boundaries of the empire within the banks of the Euphrates. He turned his whole attention towards peace, and the administration of impartial justice in the interior of the state; he even granted pensions to several barbarian kings; although, at the same time, he entertained a numerous body of troops, to which he gave an admirable discipline, and which he kept in constant exercise, as if preparing for immediate war. Antoninus, who succeeded him, did not recede from this wise plan; and he too, thought more of defending, than of extending, the limits of the empire. Never had pagan Rome an emperor more strictly just, or more scrupulously virtuous; nor did ever emperor possess so much authority and influence over foreign nations, or had fewer wars to sustain than Antoninus.

The reign of Marcus Aurelius was not so peaceable. In the East the Parthians and Armenians commenced hostilities, while

the Marcomanni, the Narisqui, the Hormonduri, the Quadi, the Moors and other barbarous hordes, in incredible numbers poured into the Roman territories, and plundered and dismantled the towns and provinces in the West: over all these enemies Marcus Aurelius obtained considerable advantages, but was eventually constrained to allow many of them to settle in the provinces of the empire. His son Commodus exceeded, if possible, all the vicious emperors who had preceded him, in every species of profligacy, of cruelty and extravagance. Under his inauspicious reign, the empire was on every side assailed with a destructive war. The efforts, however, of these numerous hosts of enemies from without, it courageously withstood; but at home it was torn in pieces by the fury of Commodus, and the intolerable exactions of his rapacious governors. The hands of conspirators rid the earth of this monster, born for the calamity and the disgrace of human nature. He was succeeded by Pertinax, who himself after a short reign was assassinated by the Prætorian guards. The insolence of these bands was at the highest pitch; and they publicly offered the empire to the best bidder. Julian, a man of pleasure and immensely rich, but equally void of principle, of talents, and of learning, made the splendid purchase, and was accordingly proclaimed emperor at Rome. The armies of the East, Illyricum, and Great Britain, severally chose their respective emperors. These were—Niger, Albinus and Severus, who waged a furious war against each other till the close of this century. Severus triumphed eventually over all his competitors, and remained sole master of the empire.

Such was the *political* state of things during the second century. The *religion* universally established over the Roman empire, and indeed, over the whole earth till the birth of christianity, was Polytheism or rank idolatry. Every where the people, as heretofore, adored dumb idols of wood and stone, and offered to their imaginary deities sacrifices of human blood. The emperor Claudius, it is true, abolished the last mentioned impious and cruel rites. But Trajan, who affected to revere a supreme Being, *permitted* his infatuated subjects to immolate victims even to his own statues, and to swear by his life and immortality. Human sacrifices, notwithstanding their prohibition, were again renewed in his reign; and two male Greeks, with two Gallic females, were buried alive in the market place at Rome, in order to avert the evils impending over the empire. (Plut. quest. sur les Rom.) Adrian, though one of the most enlightened scholars of the age, had recourse on all occasions to divination and magic: he consecrated temples to his own divinity, and even deified after death his infamous favorite Antinous. (Spart. Adriani vit.) Antoninus, too, was a scrupulous observer of all the ceremonies of paganism: nor was his successor Marcus Aurelius a less bigotted devotee to every species of superstition. Severus

ranked the monster Commodus in the number of the gods ; instituted festivals to his honor, and appointed a high-priest to preside over the worship of this portentous deity. Of such extravagant instances of deification the christians did not fail to make a proper handle, and to infer triumphantly against idolaters, what kind of gods those also were, whom they had deified in a similar manner in more ancient times.

In the mean while christianity had been diffused through all the provinces of the Roman empire, and among the various nations with which the Romans were in commerce : the temples of false gods were almost totally abandoned, and their sacrifices in great part were interrupted. The populace, stirred up by the priests and those whom motives of interest still attached to their pagan superstition, loudly demanded the punishment of the christians ; and the magistrates put them to the most cruel deaths. Notwithstanding all this rigor, their numbers daily increased ; and Trajan, to prevent the depopulation of the empire, by a strange and inconsistent policy, forbade the christians to be sought for ; while he directed them to be punished in case they were denounced.

An edict so replete with folly worse than infantile, did not arrest the progress of christianity. The miracles and the zeal of its professors in announcing their religion ; the purity of their morals, and that admirable constancy with which they chose to spill their blood rather than prevaricate : the consoling truths which they proposed to the consideration of mankind ; that blissful eternity which they held out to those who suffered death for the love of Jesus Christ, and the supernatural helps which they received from heaven in propagating the gospel, increased their numbers beyond all calculation. In effect, what could the infuriated mandates of tyrants do against a religion so divine ; or the fear of death, in regard of those whose sole ambition was to die ? The law which prohibited christians to be sought for, was esteemed by many—a misfortune which deprived them of the crown of martyrdom : they presented themselves before the tribunals of their own accord, and boldly declared that they were followers of Christ. Adrian, though superstitious in the extreme, admired their virtue, and ordered the tumultuary accusations of the populace to be disregarded ; nor would he suffer any to be put to death without the proof of some notorious crime. This edict the pagan priests and a bigotted rabble did their utmost to have repealed. They represented the christians in colours the most odious, and imputed to them the dreadful earthquakes which had desolated many provinces. The states of Asia, and other countries, with pious eagerness, solicited of Antoninus, the permission to search after, and to put to death, the innocent professors of the gospel. Antoninus saw the unreasonableness, and the injustice, of persecuting men for their

religious principles, who had no other crime than that of dissenting from the common opinion in their system of belief. Marcus Aurelius was not quite so delicate in his ideas of justice; nor of principles so liberal and enlightened. He involved the christians, with the various sects of gnostics—men of infamous and abandoned morals, in one common writ of persecution, and regarded them as a set of gloomy fanatics who voluntarily rushed upon their own destruction. However, even under the reign of Commodus christianity enjoyed some intervals of repose; also during the revolutions which convulsed the Roman empire upon the death of Pertinax, and under the rival emperors Julian, Niger and Albinus. But Severus again renewed the persecution—though with no better success than those who went before him.

While thus the whole power of the empire was employed for the destruction of the christians, their persons and their doctrines were at the same time furiously attacked by a numerous phalanx of philosophers;—Cynics, Epicureans, Pythagoreans, &c. Among these were—Crescens, Celsus, Fronto and a crowd of sophists; some of whom demanded with unfeeling asperity and malice the death of these pretended enemies of mankind. (Orig. cont. Cels. Justin, Apol. pro Christ. 23. Euseb. Hist. Eccles. l. 4. Minut. Felix.) In the midst of such alarming obstacles, the christian religion pushed its conquests to the remotest quarters of the globe: it had erected its victorious standard—at Rome, at Athens, at Alexandria;—and even in the most celebrated schools of each philosophic sect, though supported by the fury of popular commotion, the authority of the laws, and the power of arbitrary rulers.

This amazing growth of christianity is attested by all christian writers, as well as by the pagan authors of the times. Pliny remarked it to the emperor Trajan; and the impious Lucian is compelled to acknowledge, that all places at that early period, were already filled with christians. Nor were these christians a set of men remarkable for their credulity, or for their love of novelty; or a superstitious and stupid rabble: they were persons of all ranks and descriptions, whose subtilty of understanding and depth of genius were the terror of impostors: in *their* presence these seducers forbade the pretended mysteries of their vaunted new mythology to be exhibited, for fear of their detection. (Plin. Ep. l. 10. ep. 97. Lucian Pseudomant. Justin. Tert. Apol.) This, however, did not prevent a vast number of sectaries from propagating their extravagant theories in the second age. Saturninus, Basilides, Carpocrates; Valentinus, Cerdo, Marcion and Hermogenes; Hermias, Bardesanes, Appelles; Tatian, and Severus, and Heraclian; the Sethians, the Cainites, the Ophites:—some, in order, as they fancied, more effectually to withdraw their hearts from earthly things, and to fix them more

securely in heaven, absolutely interdicted themselves every kind of pleasure: others on the contrary, looked upon pleasures as a tribute due to the angels whom they imagined to be the creators of this lower world; or else esteemed them things indifferent in themselves, and of course not apt to contaminate the soul. These indulged in the most scandalous immorality: some went naked, like Adam and Eve in the state of innocence; others, in the opposite extreme, condemned as criminal whatever might have the remotest tendency to excite the passions. All alike notwithstanding, pretended sedulously to practise what Jesus Christ came down to teach mankind, in order to conduct them safe to heaven. Some acknowledged him to be the Son of God; others an angel; others again, supposed him to be a mere human being, upon whom the divinity had lavished his gifts with a more liberal hand than upon any other mortal man.—All without exception, acknowledged the truth of the miracles of our Lord; and all had condescended to new-model their original system of philosophy, in order to facilitate their explanation: these miracles, therefore, must have been, in the highest degree, incontestible; since even systematic pride owned itself unable to contest them. Thus were the dogmas of the Pythagorean, the Platonic and the Stoic philosophy combined with the superstitious practices of magic and astrology, all employed in attempting to elucidate the miracles and the doctrines of christianity; and all these fanciful inventors of new sects endeavoured to assert the plausibility of their pretensions, in opposition to their rival empirics of the day. They had every where their respective preachers, who by the affected austerity of their life, or by their loose morality and some fictitious miracles, seduced the people, and communicated to them their own fanaticism. Some of these sectaries found means widely to extend their society. The numerous sects of the Basilidians, the Valentinians, the Marcionites, were distinguished and upheld by the severity of their morals, which tended, they conceived, to restrain the passions, and to rid mankind of the tyranny of the senses. Such was the general enthusiasm of the age. Among christians this system of morality produced a set of men who carried the spirit of rigorism and mortification far beyond the boundaries which religion and the church prescribed. These men did not in the ardor of their zeal, undertake to form a society apart;—but they soon began to conceive themselves to be more perfect than the rest of their christian brethren, and their morality more sublime. Hence Montanus, a proud and self-conceited man, took occasion to style himself the Reformer of that religion taught by Jesus Christ. He pretended, that our blessed Redeemer had promised to send down the Holy Ghost—to teach a religion still more perfect than his own; that he [Montanus] was himself the Holy Ghost, or the prophet by whose mouth the Holy

Spirit caused this more perfect dispensation to be announced to men. The impostor had disciples who affected to be inspired like himself, and formed a numerous sect divided into a variety of branches, which differed from each other only in a few ridiculous observances. Martyrdom was the watch-word of this sect; and hence we find a multitude of Montanists suffering death in support of their superstition. It survived the storm of persecution, and continued to exist till the fifth century.

Montanus and his sectaries, notwithstanding their apparent regularity of life, in a council of orthodox bishops had been re-trenched from the communion of the faithful. Thus the church, ever incorruptible in its morality as well as in its doctrine, shewed itself equally averse from all extremes and every species of excess: consequently, the establishment of the christian religion is not the result of enthusiasm, as some modern infidels vainly would have us to believe.

Most heresies broached in the two first centuries, were a compound of pagan philosophy with the dogmas of christianity: accordingly, they were combated by christian theologists with philosophic principles, and with those of reason. The beauty of their writings; their reputation and eventual success, attracted the attention of all to the study of philosophy. Religious subjects began to be treated with the nicest regard to method; and the proofs of the christian doctrine were supported by dint of argument, and the maxims of the most celebrated sages of antiquity. Too servile an adhesion to this rule produced effects the most mischievous in their consequences. Certain christians affected to render the mysteries of our faith more credible by assimilating them with the ideas borrowed exclusively from reason. Religion suffered by the comparison; and its doctrines were modelled according to the fancies of these conceited innovators. Such were—Artemon and Theodotus, who eventually contested the divinity of Jesus Christ; and the Melchisedecians, who pretended that he was inferior to Melchisedec.

Artemon, Theodotus, and the Melchisedecians, were censured by the church, and cut off from the communion of the faithful: their erroneous doctrines were refuted by the concurrent authorities of holy scripture, the hymns and canticles composed at the commencement of christianity, and the writings of ecclesiastical authors, who were more ancient than any of these sectarists: consequently, the divinity of Jesus Christ was distinctly taught in the church as a fundamental article, and recognised as such in the sacred hymns composed in the very infancy of our holy religion.

It taught against Marcion, Cerdo, Saturninus, &c. the unity of the Divine nature, the first cause and great principle of all things; and against Cerinthus, Artemon, Theodotus, &c. that Jesus Christ was true God. Praxeas, who was con-

temporary with Theodotus, erroneously concluded, that Jesus Christ could not be a divine person distinct from God the Father; and was himself condemned as Theodotus had been before him; though he did not form any sect.

May I here be allowed to re-assert, that the christian church taught distinctly at this early period: 1, the consubstantiality of the word; believing, as she did, one only divine substance,—eternal, existing necessarily, and infinite in its attributes; and that Jesus Christ was truly God; 2,—that the church then as distinctly proposed the doctrine of the Blessed Trinity, and professed it as a fundamental dogma of christianity.

These are undeniable facts, which alone suffice to overturn, and at once triumphantly to do away—the system of Socinus, together with those of Clark, Whiston, and their anti-trinitarian brethren, regarding the most Blessed Trinity, and the consubstantiality of the Son of God.

While thus the infant church had to contend with heresy and persecution, Judea since the death of Herod was become a province of the Roman empire. The Jews, notwithstanding, still preserved the purity of their religion; and their very intercourse with the idolators, as well as the tyranny of their governors and collectors of the public taxes, confirmed and increased their hatred of the Romans, and their aversion for idolators in general, even to a degree of frenzy. Their expectations of a Deliverer, who was to subdue all the nations of the earth, disposed the minds of the ignorant to insurrection; which, accordingly, did not fail to burst forth into a flame both at Jerusalem, throughout all Judea, in Syria, and in Egypt. Vespasian is sent against them at the head of a Roman army; and his son Titus enters Jerusalem by storm,—demolishes the temple with the greater part of that devoted city,—sells its wretched inhabitants for slaves, and disperses the remainder of the Jewish people over almost the whole habitable world.

With the city and the temple of Jerusalem, the Jewish religion lost whatever was calculated to impress the mind with awe and veneration. The Jews themselves remained in a state of disorganization, intermixed with the inhabitants of the most distant nations of the globe. Still; however, they universally retained an implacable aversion for the rest of mankind; and their hopes of a Messiah, whom they vainly figured to themselves as a mighty conqueror, seemed to increase with their misfortunes. These were circumstances which continually impelled the Jewish people to revolt. Nor were impostors wanting to personate the Messiah, and by some ingenious deception to induce them to believe their mission was from God. Thus did the torch of rebellion blaze out at Alexandria,—over all Egypt, Thebais and Lydia,—in Cyprus, and in Mesopotamia, under the reign of the emperor Trajan. When Adrian his successor

in the empire, was preparing to send a colony to Jerusalem, the impostor Barcochebas stepped forth, and was anointed and recognised by the Jewish rabbins for their king and Saviour. The Romans at first despised him; but when they saw him at the head of a numerous army, and upon the point of being joined by all the Jews, the imperial legions were sent against them; and prodigious numbers on this occasion fell victims to their own infatuation. An edict was issued, forbidding them to enter Jerusalem, or even to reside in any place whence Jerusalem might be seen. This, however, did not discourage them; and whenever circumstances seemed to promise eventual success, they failed not to rise in arms. In the close of the second century, this restless people once more, to their cost, insulted the Roman eagles, during the reign of the emperor Severus.

Such was the forlorn and unsettled state of the Jews after the destruction of Jerusalem. The priests who had survived the fate of this unhappy city, lay concealed in Palestine, and there endeavoured to collect the remnant of their scattered nation. As they were better grounded than the rest of the Jews, in their religion and jurisprudence, to *them* their exiled countrymen had recourse for instruction. They chose out of their body the person whom they deemed best qualified, to regulate in the different synagogues what regarded the law, the ceremonies, and their solemn worship. This person was at the head of the college of priests who resided in Palestine, and who did not wish to remove to a greater distance from Jerusalem, where they expected to see their temple re-established. He was the patriarch of the Jews in exile: *His* duty it was to visit the synagogues; and *these* defrayed the expences of his journeys.

Third age of the christian era.

The wars of Severus with his rivals Julian, Niger and Albinus; the cruel vengeance which he exercised upon their several friends and adherents; his avarice, his brutal inhumanity, desolated the state, and caused vast numbers of his subjects and of the soldiery to seek protection among barbarians. However, as he was consummately skilled in the art of war, and of superior talents for government, the empire still continued powerful during his reign, and made the surrounding nations tremble.

Severus was succeeded by Caracalla, who with all the vices of his father carried to their utmost excess, joined not one of his better qualities. The seeds of disaffection and revolt which the genius of Severus had stifled in the interior of the state, now began on the sudden to develope; and the hereditary hatred which foreigners had imbibed for the Roman name, and which he had hitherto kept at bay, at once burst forth, and was inflamed to a

degree of fury by the unheard of perfidy of Caracalla; while avarice, ambition and voluptuousness, vices which even before his reign had proceeded to an alarming pitch, daily gained ground throughout the whole empire. In the course of this century (such was the anarchy and confusion of the times) more than twenty emperors were raised successively to the throne, chiefly by the hands of faction and seditious influence, or by the murder of their respective predecessors. Hardly, in effect, was an emperor assassinated, when his murderer seized the reins of government; and four or five competitors at once disputed with him the privilege of reigning. Often when all appeared in profound peace and harmony, would the flame of sedition suddenly blaze forth in four or five different provinces at a time; just as a dreadful storm spreads sudden desolation in its progress over the tracts in which it spends its fury. In these intestine commotions of the state three of the best and greatest emperors that Rome had ever beheld; Alexander, Aurelian and Probus—all shared a similar fate with the monsters Heliogabalus and Caracalla.

Thus torn in pieces by its own hands, the empire was assailed on every side,—by the Scythians, the Parthians, the Persians, the Goths, the Heruli, the Germans; and by that confused medley of barbarians, distinguished under the appellation of Franks. These furious hordes now penetrated the empire in all directions; and it was compelled to purchase a precarious peace of those very people, to whom heretofore it had been accustomed to grant it upon the most humiliating terms. The booty which they carried off on these occasions, was an allurement too tempting for these savage adventurers to resist; and the hopes of greater plunder perpetuated a destructive war, which terminated in the eventual downfall of the Roman empire. Gross idolatry, with all its attendant horrors, still prevailed, and almost the very idea of virtue and justice seemed extinct in the pagan world. Such was the horrible degeneracy of the Roman senate, that they decreed divine honors and the title of God even to a Caracalla, the murderer of his own father and brother, the bloody executioner of the people, and the terror and execration of all mankind. The champions of paganism, indeed, and the persecutors of the christians, were in general, men of abandoned characters, and notoriously wicked. The palpable absurdity, and the glaring inconsistencies of their own mythology, had been exposed by christian writers in the brightest light of evidence; and their philosophers were reduced to the miserable shift of new-modelling their various systems; in order to reconcile, if possible, the discordant theories of polytheism and the different philosophic sects—with some degree of plausibility and harmony in their leading principles. Ammonius was the first deviser of this hodge-podge of philosophism, which became extremely fashionable in the third age, and was termed the eclectic sect.

The Jews had been dispersed and intermingled with almost every nation of the globe. Thus, wherever the christian religion was announced, it found its mortal enemies; enemies very capable of convicting it of imposture, had there been a possibility of substantiating the charge. To the Jews many of the Roman emperors had been favourable, and granted them certain privileges, allowing them to establish academies, and to cultivate the sciences. Their school of Tiberias became very famous; and they had some celebrated rabbinical doctors at Babylon. In the beginning of the reign of Severus, both Jews and christians were tolerated; but a cruel policy soon took place, and again subjected the professors of christianity to the rigours of persecution, during the remainder of this emperor's reign. However, Caracalla and Heliogabalus did not oppose the progress of christianism; and Alexander Severus, the best of Heathen princes, patronised its professors, admitted them to his court, and even called them to his privy council. Maximin renewed the persecution; but Gordian and Philip befriended their cause. Decius, the murderer of his master Philip, was their implacable enemy. But Gallus who succeeded him, restored peace to the church; although eventually he became himself its ruthless persecutor: so did Valerian after him; whose impiety was quickly arrested by the Divine justice, in the commencement of his rage, as Lactantius remarks; and in his person was exhibited to the world a striking instance of the inconstancy of human things. Gallien beheld with seeming indifference his father's misery; and whilst he suffered him to drag on in captivity a dying life, he put a stop to the persecution raised by him, and caused the christian churches and cemetaries to be restored. After a reign of fifteen years Gallien was assassinated, and his successor, Claudius II. published his bloody edicts against the true religion; but his reign was short. Aurelian restored tranquillity to the innocent sufferers; and after his death they were permitted to enjoy a long interval of peace, nearly till the close of this century. Their numbers had prodigiously increased, especially under those emperors who had allowed them the free exercise of their religion. They practised it in the midst of the palace, where they occupied important charges,—had gained the affection and the confidence of their princes, and possessed considerable interest at court. The bishops, whose character was highly respected in the provinces, were permitted to build churches; and their flocks were astonishingly numerous.

Nor was christianity confined within the precincts of the Roman jurisdiction; its zealous disciples propagated its doctrines among the barbarous nations in commerce with the empire. Sometimes the enemies of the Roman name in their hostile depredations carried off a multitude of captives: some of them

were christians, who disseminated among these people the bright example of the sublimest virtues, and the admirable light of the gospel.

While thus the church of Christ continued to flourish, and to increase even under the axe of persecution, it vigorously repressed and condemned every attempt at innovation in its doctrine and the purity of its morals. In the close of the foregoing century, it was fashionable to join the study of philosophy with that of religion. This philosophy was neither Platonism nor Stoicism ; it consisted in adopting whatever in any philosophic system reason discovered to be true ; and every one in consequence, thought himself privileged to elucidate the mysteries of religion by those maxims of the ancient sages, which appeared to him best calculated to render them intelligible. In fact, the awful obscurity of our mysteries was ever a great stumbling block to infidels, and to the wise ones of this world.

The grand mysteries of our holy faith are not contrary to reason ; but they are exalted infinitely above it. Reason, therefore, is not competent to suggest any idea which may render them obvious to the understanding ; and many, not aware of this, in the attempt to explain them by the common principles of reason, altered and adulterated them. Thus did Beryllus, Noetus, Sabellius, Paul of Samosata and Hierax, give explanations regarding the mysteries of the blessed Trinity and the incarnation of the Son of God, that tended absolutely to do away the mysteries themselves. The church then condemned these fatal errors, with many others of a tendency equally pernicious ; and excluded their abettors from its pale : thus we see, the Trinity of persons and the Divinity of Jesus Christ,—the spirituality and immortality of the soul, were dogmas clearly established and distinctly taught in the church of God, during the third age ; as these sentences of excommunication against their impugnors abundantly demonstrate.

Meanwhile, other christian philosophers, more cautious and more discerning than the former, combated with success the various sects of Gnostics who had made their appearance in the preceding ages ; and reclaimed them from their extravagant errors. The church had not yet decided by any positive law, upon what terms the reclaimed should be admitted. Africa and the East classed them with the Catechumens, and re-baptised them. In the West, on the contrary, they were not re-baptised, but were received barely with the imposition of hands. This diversity of practice gave rise to much contention, and nearly caused a schism in the church. Those, too, who in the times of persecution had renounced their faith, demanded with great earnestness their re-admission to communion : some wished them to be received without the humiliating ceremony of canonical penance ; others insisted that this could not be dispensed with :

others again, still more rigidly severe, pretended that they ought not to be re-admitted into the church, on any terms whatever. This variety of opinions produced party-spirit and division, with some sects. Of this the Novatians are one instance.

Fourth age.

Almost all the subjugated nations;—the Persians, the Scythians, the Goths; Franks, Germans, and other barbarous tribes, allured by the hopes of plunder, broke impetuously into the Roman provinces. It was therefore absolutely necessary to entertain and keep embodied a formidable military force, without which the empire could not withstand the efforts of its enemies, and which itself, nevertheless, was capable of annihilating at once both the emperors and the empire. Dioclesian, in order to ward off inconveniences eventually so mischievous to the state, resolved to share the weight of government with Maximus—a warrior consummately qualified for the conduct of armies, as his colleague in the empire; and with Galerius and Constantius Chlorus, whom he created Cesars or emperors of inferior rank. This system, he thought, would give a check to the spirit of faction in the armies, which, separately, would be too weak to claim the privilege of raising their respective generals to the sovereignty, and would likewise counteract the ambition of commanders, and even of the emperors themselves, by deterring them from assuming undue superiority over their colleagues. This policy, however, far from answering the views of Dioclesian, gave the Roman empire four masters: they all aspired equally to absolute authority, formed their several alliances apart, and incessantly waged war against each other, till Constantine became sole master of the empire. On his death-bed, he adopted the impolitic system of Dioclesian, and divided his dominions amongst his children. These did not long remain content with the partition, and made war with one another; while they were all attacked by ambitious competitors, and perished in the contest, except Constantius, who again re-united in his own person the sovereignty of the state.

During the whole of the fourth century was the empire thus divided and re-united by turns—under Valentinian, Gratian, Theodosius, and his sons Arcadius and Honorius. Meanwhile the barbarians from without harassed the provinces with continual incursions. Incredible were the calamities which attended this unceasing state of warfare; and the loss of blood was immense. Still, however, the Roman discipline maintained a decided superiority in the tumultuary attacks of these savage invaders, and still nobly asserted the integrity of the empire.

Dioclesian, in the beginning of his reign, had favored the

christian religion. His palace was full of distinguished christian noblemen, and many even of the Pretorian guards were of this profession, both in the capacity of officers and privates. But as the emperor was himself a bigotted pagan, and superstitious to a degree, means were devised to alarm his bigotry and inflame his heathen zeal to madness. A dreadful persecution was the consequence. Maximius and Galerius were the implacable enemies of christianity in the East, while their rival Constantius protected it in the West. His son Constantine was equally favorable; but Licinius, Constantine's competitor and his most treacherous foe, persecuted the christians in the most outrageous manner throughout the Eastern districts of the empire. Constantine marched against his frantic antagonist, fully determined to wrest from him that power which he so wantonly abused. Licinius had caused a crowd of augurs, magicians, and Egyptian priests, to attend him at his camp: these vainly called upon their imaginary deities, offered to them innumerable sacrifices, and promised him an easy victory. Constantine, on the other hand, environed with the christian priesthood, and with the banner of the cross triumphantly displayed before him, implored the succour of the Supreme God, and reposed his hopes of victory in Him alone. Heaven recompensed his pious expectations with the total overthrow of the impious Licinius, who had vowed, in the event of success, to immolate all the Romans—meaning principally the christians—to his heathen gods.

The morality of the christian religion was pure and sublime: Constantine had no subjects more faithful, nor the empire citizens more virtuous, more scrupulously just, or of principles more benevolent and humane; nor were any of them ever known to have taken part in insurrection against the most inhuman of their persecutors. Had Constantine been influenced merely by motives of policy, this circumstance alone must have determined him to prefer the christian religion before all others, to form of it the established religion of the state. In aid of motives purely human, were added—miracles of the Divine power in this emperor's favour, which rendered him victorious over all his rivals. In an edict, recorded by Eusebius in his life of Constantine, this prince addresses himself to the Almighty, and protests before Him his zeal to extend the Divine worship. At the same time, he declares it his intention, that even the impious shall enjoy unmolested a state of tranquillity and peace—under his protection; convinced, that this is the surest method to bring them back eventually to the right way. He forbids them to be disturbed; exhorts his subjects mutually to support and aid each other, however opposite may be their religious sentiments; and to communicate their lights to their fellow-creatures without violence or compulsion; because, says

he, "in the cause of religion it is noble rather to *suffer* death than to *inflict* it, notwithstanding the contrary pretensions of some christians, influenced with an indiscreet and cruel zeal." (Vit. Const. l. 2, c. 60.)

Nevertheless he prohibited the offering of sacrifices, shut up the temples of the heathen gods, and caused them afterwards to be demolished. The power and renown of this emperor; the translation by him of the seat of empire to Constantinople; his triumphs over his enemies, together with the wonderful establishment of christianity, and the evidence of miracles wrought in his favor, attracted the attention of the most distant nations. The Goths and other barbarous people, who had long been accustomed to make inroads upon the Roman territories, and on those occasions had carried off vast multitudes of christian captives, were by them converted to the faith, and now professed the christian religion. The Ethiopians too, applied to Constantine for christian bishops; while the Jews, on the contrary, possessed with the silly idea of subjugating the rest of mankind, continued to avail themselves of every opportunity which seemed to favor their extravagant pretensions. Against them, Constantine enacted severe laws; and after his demise his sons dispatched a military force to reduce them to submission. Valentinian and Theodosius granted them certain privileges; and the latter of those princes forbade christians to molest them or to pull down their synagogues. They had judges—both civil and ecclesiastic—of their own, whose decisions were enforced in all matters appertaining to religion or to religious discipline; in other instances they were subject to the laws of the empire.

In the midst of the tumult of war and faction which convulsed the universe till the period when Constantine became absolute throughout the whole extent of the Roman dynasty, the arts and sciences were cultivated almost exclusively, by heathen philosophers and the christians. The latter, in order to combat with success the arguments of sophism, the impostures of the pagan priesthood, and the infidelity of historians, applied themselves with diligence to the study of history and chronology, and discussed profoundly the various systems of the ancient philosophic sects. They undertook to demonstrate the truth of the christian religion—by the most conclusive arguments which the authority of history or reason can afford; and to show—that the principles admitted by the most celebrated philosophers, either were not at variance with it, or in the points on which they disagreed, they stood self-refuted, or contradicted one another, and were inconsistent with the dictates of right reason. Sometimes indeed, in the writings of these philosophers, and those of the epoch of which we speak, amidst a thousand absurdities we discover surprising strength of genius and much natural sagacity, and not unfrequently a rich vein of the sublimest

morality. However, in the reign of Valens the Platonic philosophy received a severe check. Some of its professors, by the aid of the black art, had ventured to predict, that this emperor's successor would bear a name which began with the initials *Theod.* The jealous emperor in revenge caused all of that sect who had the misfortune to fall into his hands, indiscriminately, to be put to death, and their writings to be committed to the flames. Such was the rigor with which this inhuman and not less stupid ordinance was executed, that an infinite number of the best productions of antiquity in every kind, were sacrificed on the occasion, and utterly lost to posterity.

Among the christians of this age many were distinguished for their genius and erudition, whose writings would do honor to any era. Such were—Pamphilus, Eusebius, Arnobius, Lactantius; the Gregories, the Basils, &c. These celebrated characters employed much of their time and labors in the instruction of their people: and, in the midst of the most troublesome occurrences, the bishops and the clergy, influenced by motives the most powerful that can act upon the human heart, exerted their utmost efforts in order to enlighten the minds of their fellow creatures—relative to their original destination, the grand truths of religion, the true happiness of man, and the eternal recompence which awaits the just in the life to come. The extraordinary merit of the bishops ensured to them the highest veneration throughout the church, and an authority next to absolute over the faithful.

The honors which they every where received, excited the ambition of the envious, and caused them to aspire with ardour to ecclesiastical preferment; this proved, eventually, the source of much mischief, and of schisms in the church. Donatus, Colluthus and Arius, were characters of this description. The church had condemned the errors of Sabellius, Praxeas and Noetus, who in the preceding age had pretended, that the three Divine Persons of the blessed Trinity were nothing more than simple denominations, given to the same divine substance—in order to denote the various operations of the divinity: but it had not thought proper to explain—in what manner the three Divine Persons actually existed in the self-same substance. Arius would needs undertake to elucidate the mystery. He imagined that the three Divine Persons of the blessed Trinity were three distinct substances, and that the Father alone was increated. Consequently, the Son, according to his new system, was a mere creature; an inference which Macedonius afterwards extended to the Holy Ghost.

In combating the system of Arius, Apollinaris adduced an infinite number of clear texts out of Holy Scripture, to prove the Divinity of Jesus Christ; from which, however, he erroneously inferred, that our blessed Saviour had not a human but

only a sensitive soul, the divinity in him supplying its place. This false doctrine the church equally condemned with that of other innovators of the age;—Audeus, Bonosus, Helvidius and Jovinian;—the Collyridians, the barefooted brethren, the Mes-salians, the Priscillianists, &c. These jarring sects were the cause of great disorders in the empire, and often were engaged in intestine broils. Africa and the East were torn in pieces with the schism of the Donatists, and the heresy of Arius. Every religious dispute under the successors of Constantine was considered an affair of state; and those whom the court, whether itself orthodox or otherwise, was pleased to deem unorthodox, were exiled, dismissed from office, or forfeited their estates. An infinite number of subjects on these occasions emigrated into Arabia and Persia, and among other barbarous nations which surrounded the Roman empire: those that remained, seemed for the most part, to center their contentment in the destruction of the adverse party. New heresies and new schisms succeeded one another in this turbulent state of things; and the church long deplored the mischiefs occasioned by those of Antioch, in which prejudice, the passions, and an ungoverned zeal, assumed a thousand different disguises, counterfeiting piety and the love of truth.

Fifth age.

The great Theodosius had in vain attempted to stem the tide of the reigning disorders in the preceding age. Unfortunately, his children were formed under the tuition of favourites—ambitious, ill-principled and totally devoid of all exalted views. They were left by him masters of the empire very young: Arcadius had the East, and Honorius the West. At the head of the administration were Rufinus and Stilico. Rufinus—of an artful, insinuating, adulatory disposition, whose avarice was insatiable and ambition boundless, was all-powerful in the East. He unfeelingly oppressed the people, sold the dignities of the state to men of the basest character, and rendered government odious and intolerable to the subject. His conduct could not fail of raising him many enemies, who accused him of aspiring to the empire; and he was put to death by the order of the emperor his master. He was succeeded by another favorite court-minion vicious as himself,—Eutropius the eunuch. This man fell a sacrifice to the resentment of Eudocia,—not for his unheard of cruelties and other crimes, by which he had brought ruin on the empire; but for his disrespectful behaviour towards a haughty female. Eudocia in her turn became absolute. She was a woman whose ruling passion was avarice: her counsellors were the ladies of the court, with the eunuchs that surrounded her. Un-

der her influence were renewed all the disorders which characterised the administration of Rufinus and Eutropius.

Mean while Arcadius, insensible to the evils of the state, was busily employed in the detection of unorthodoxy; and while Rufinus and Eutropius abused at pleasure in the most wanton manner, the authority entrusted to them, this imbecile prince turned his whole attention exclusively to the aggrandisement of the church; which he imagined he did effectually by banishing those officers of his court, who were found to err in faith, however inconsiderable might be their error, and however great in other respects, their merit. His son Theodosius, trained in the same school, and formed like his father under the discipline of eunuchs and intriguing courtiers, passed his days in inglorious ease and voluptuary indolence, while the hands of barbarians, and the rapacity of his own officers, despoiled and drained the provinces of all their remaining wealth. Patriotism, in every breast was now extinct; and thousands continued to migrate into foreign countries.

Marcian, who succeeded Theodosius in the empire, resolved to correct these internal disorders; but lived not long enough to accomplish his design. Leo I. Zeno, Basiliscus, Anastasius,—the creatures of faction, occupied successively the imperial throne. They were weak and voluptuous princes, who sacrificed every thing to their avarice, their cruelty and vicious disposition.

At the period when Rufinus reigned under the auspices of Arcadius in the East, Stilico was equally despotic in the West under Honorius, and like the former, came to an untimely end. The empire was full of disaffected subjects;—of *heretics* whom Honorius and his predecessors had despoiled of their effects and the dignities which they enjoyed;—and of unfortunate families, which the rapacity of the governors, and excessive extortion, had reduced to the most ruinous condition. After the death of Stilico, these poor people rose in mutiny; and the ministers who succeeded him, were incapable of quelling the sedition: others were substituted in their place, as unqualified as their predecessors. Honorius had not the discernment necessary to choose an able minister; and those amongst his courtiers who were qualified, did not wish to recommend one of that description. On the sudden stepped forth three pretenders to the empire. England no longer formed a Roman province; the towns in Gaul, erecting themselves into so many small independent states, joined in a league for their mutual defence against the Alani, the Vandals and the Suevi. The latter, intimidated by this formidable combination, opened themselves a passage over the Pyrenean mountains, and entered Spain; where they finally established themselves in certain provinces of that country.

Thus the Western empire under Honorius was in the most dreadful state of confusion. Alaric took and pillaged Rome; Atolphus, his successor, seized Languedoc, and the Burgundians subjugated a part of Gaul. Upon the death of Honorius, his chief secretary John assumed the imperial ornaments, and was acknowledged by the whole empire. This prince was taken prisoner by Theodosius's army, and delivered to Valentinian nephew to the former, by whose orders he was put to death. Valentinian permitted himself to be governed by court favourites and eunuchs. Under his reign the Vandals made themselves masters of a great part of Africa; Gaul and Italy were ravaged by the Huns, and England by the Picts. Maximus, whose wife Valentinian had used dishonourably, revenged the affront by his death, and placed himself upon the throne. He took to his bed Eudocia widow to Valentinian—against her will. This lady, in resentment of the injury, invited Genseric into Italy. Genseric laid waste the territories of the empire; and once more did unhappy Rome become a prey to the rapacity and brutality of Gothic insolence. Maximus was murdered by his own subjects, and was succeeded by Avitus, who himself was quickly compelled to abdicate the imperial dignity. Majorinus followed, and was assassinated by Ricimer. The patrician Severus, Majorinus's friend, seized the reins of government, and shared a similar fate from the hands of the treacherous Ricimer. After an interregnum of twenty months, Anthemius took upon himself the title of emperor, and reigned five years; when he also fell by the perfidy of the turbulent and ambitious Ricimer, who next preferred Olybrius to the throne. Glycerius, count of the household, deposed Olybrius, and was himself superseded by Nepos. Nepos, too, was obliged to give place to Orestes, who proclaimed his son Romulus emperor, under the name of Augustulus. The partisans of Nepos invited into Italy Odoacer king of Bohemia, who defeated Orestes, and caused him to be put to death. Odoacer thus became master of Italy; although, contenting himself with his title of king, he did not assume that of emperor. He was a prince respected and adored by his subjects. Britain at this epoch fell a prey to the Saxons; and the Goths and Visigoths established themselves in Gaul. Thus was the Roman dynasty annihilated in the West.

Polytheism had still its votaries, who, notwithstanding the edicts of the emperors, and the efforts of the christians, exerted their utmost ingenuity in its defence, and imputed all the misfortunes which befel the empire to its downfall. The christians were not backward in refuting the pretensions of their adversaries; and these disputes cherished the love of philosophy and of erudition, equally among the champions of truth and falsehood. Their philosophy was altogether theological, and turned

wholly upon religious disquisition ;—Pythagoreanism and Platonism, accommodated to the Pagan mythology,—with a view to its justification by its votaries, and applied by christian controversialists for the purpose of defeating it with its own weapons. Arcadius and Honorius, who reigned in the early part of the fifth century, convinced that Theodosius owed his glory and prosperity to the fervour of his piety and zeal,—without attributing any thing to his civil and military talents, enacted laws against heretics and pagans, still more severe than those of Theodosius ; and their example was followed by Theodosius II, by Marcian, and succeeding emperors. Thus did learning and the sciences, which had produced at the commencement of the fifth age an abundant harvest of great men, sensibly decay ; nay, almost totally disappear at the close of the same century : and, in fact, a government which can imagine it a sacred duty to extirpate error with fire and sword, confines its liberality to vile informers and executioners, while it abandons literary merit and the sciences to starve, and even looks upon them with an eye of jealousy as innovations dangerous to the state. However, the barbarism of the fifth age did not proceed so far. Poetry, eloquence and history, which had been cultivated with success in the preceding century, and at the commencement of the fifth, were still patronised at court ; and the empress Eudocia consort to Theodosius II. composed sacred poems, and occasionally pronounced public harangues in person. Nor was Theodosius himself niggardly in rewarding his panegyrists. But every other merit gave way to that of a fiery and indiscriminating zeal against the authors of heterodox opinions : virtue was but of secondary importance : the defects and even the crimes of zealots were easily overlooked ; while their hypocrisy passed for piety, and their pharisaical severity cast a veil over their personal disorders. Meanwhile some of the most bigoted opposers of error recently condemned, became themselves the authors or abettors of new doctrines, and themselves with equal obstinacy maintained their innovations proscribed and anathematised by the catholic church. Of this description was Nestorius a disciple of Theodorus of Mopsuestia, who in combating Apollinaris, thought he had discovered in Holy Scripture, that in Jesus Christ the human soul was totally distinct and separate from the Word, although instructed and directed by the Divinity : misled by these false principles Nestorius concluded, that the divinity resided in the humanity as in its temple, and was no otherwise united to the humanity ; and that of course, there were two persons in Jesus Christ ;—the Word,—eternal, infinite, increated ;—and man, who was a finite and created being : whatever went to unite in one person the Divine and the human nature appeared to him a contradiction, and repugnant to the faith of the church. The title of Mother of God ordinarily given to the blessed Virgin, seemed to him

equally inconsistent with that faith. The people protested against this his novel doctrine; while Nestorius, through court influence, was enabled to bear down all opposition by the rigors of confinement and the scourge. St Cyril, archbishop of Alexandria, took up his pen against Nestorius; and the whole church was quickly made acquainted with the subject of their contest. At length a general council was assembled at Ephesus, which condemned the heresiarch, and, after much tumult and confusion, Theodosius forbade the Nestorians to hold their assemblies; banished their leading men into Arabia, and confiscated their property. Many temporized, and cherished as it were the sparks of division under the embers of Nestorianism, without being styled themselves Nestorians.

A certain Nestorian refugee in Persia, availing himself of the hatred which the Persians had imbibed against the Roman name, found means to establish Nestorianism upon the ruins of catholicity in that kingdom. Thence it diffused itself over all Asia; where, in succeeding ages, it seems to have formed a constituent part of the religion of the Lamas. The extreme rigor exercised upon the abettors of Nestorianism in the East, owed its birth to Eutyches, a monk in great repute for sanctity, and all-powerful at court. In his ardor to suppress the erroneous doctrine of Nestorius, he adopted expressions which confounded the two natures in Jesus Christ, and taught that he had only one, pretending that the human nature was absorbed by the Divinity, as a drop of water when thrown into the ocean.

This man's influence at court bore him out against the authority of a council held at Constantinople, and procured another to be assembled in his favor, over which presided his friend Dioscorus of Alexandria. Here every thing was carried by violence and faction—with such unblushing effrontery, that this pretended council was justly denominated the *cabal* of Ephesus. Its decrees notwithstanding, Theodosius II. enforced with his imperial authority. Marcian who succeeded him, caused a synod to be convened at Chalcedon; which condemned Eutychianism, but could not suppress the insolence of its sectaries, who filled the Eastern empire with sedition and with bloodshed. In the midst of these horrors a thousand frivolous questions were agitated by the party; upon which they split, and formed an infinite number of ridiculous and obscure sects, one persecuting the other with unabated fury.

While thus these enthusiasts endeavoured to introduce a new creed in the East, other innovators attacked the dogmas of christianity upon grace, the liberty of man, and his perversion, in the West. Some of these pretended, that by the sole efficacy of our free will, independently of divine grace, we may attain the sublimest pitch of virtue: others, in the opposite extreme, with our modern grand reformers Luther and Calvin, subjected man

to a blind destiny which left him neither liberty nor choice. Of the former class were the Pelagians and Semipelagians; of the latter, the Predestinarians. None, however, of these last mentioned errors, were attended with consequences mischievous to the state.

Sixth age of the christian era.

Anastasius was emperor in the East at the commencement of the sixth century. Under this prince every thing was venal. He oppressed his subjects with intolerable taxes,—productive of insurrections in the provinces, and of sedition at Constantinople itself. The empire was assaulted from without by the Persians, the Bulgarians, the Arabians, and the barbarous hordes of the North; while the governors in their turn committed the most tyrannical vexations, the fruits of which they shared with Anastasius. The Eutychians too, whom Zeno had in vain attempted to re-unite with the catholics, were in open rebellion; and, at length, Anastasius himself thought fit to espouse their party. Vitalian, one of the generals of the empire, put himself at the head of the catholics, defeated the troops sent against him, and compelled the frantic emperor to desist from persecution.

Such was the state of the empire when the soldiery raised Justin to the throne. From a common soldier—without interest, and ignorant of the first elements of literature, his merit had gradually elevated him to the sovereign power. Nor did his virtue here forsake him. He governed with much prudence, and exerted equal vigor and zeal in favour of the catholic religion, as Anastasius had done to effect its ruin. Justin was succeeded by his nephew Justinian, who waged a successful war against the Huns and Persians, and gained great glory in the conquest of Italy from the Goths by his two renowned generals Belisarius and Narses. But what added more to the glory of his reign than the splendor of his victories, was a new code of laws which he took care to have selected for the use and happiness of his subjects. The Eutychians continued to embroil the state; and, in order to give a check to their fury, he enacted against them many severe ordinances, expelled from their sees the bishops of that party, and greatly reduced the sect itself; so much so, that Eutychianism seemed nearly extinct throughout the boundaries of the empire, till in the close of this prince's reign it again began to lift its head. His nephew and successor Justin II. was an effeminate and a vicious prince, during a great part of whose reign the empire was perpetually exposed to the ravages of barbarians. After Justin's decease, Tiberius was invested with the imperial dignity. Maurice succeeded Tiberius,

and gained great advantages over the foreign enemies of the state. He replaced the Persian Chosroes upon the throne; but lost his own authority together with his life, by the rebellion of Phocas, on whom the army conferred the title of Augustus.

Italy and the West had been severed from the empire towards the close of the preceding century. After a long and bloody contest, during which Rome was repeatedly taken and retaken by the contending parties, Belisarius and Narses reconquered Italy in the name of Justinian their master. In Gaul, the Burgundians, Franks and Visigoths were almost incessantly at war. The Franks who in the fifth century were divided into a variety of independent tribes,—the Salii, the Ruarrii, the Catti, &c. united under Clovis. That prince subsequently reduced the greatest part of Gaul, and established his seat of empire at Paris, where he ended his days in 511, having previously embraced the christian religion. His children divided their father's dominions. Thierry reigned at Metz, Childebert at Paris, Clothaire at Soissons, and Clodomir at Orleans. Clothaire, by repeated murders and the most atrocious crimes, re-united these different principalities, which he again retailed amongst his four children. These were perpetually at war, either by their own choice, or through the intrigues of Fredegonda—a woman of a turbulent spirit, extraordinary courage, and an ambition which stuck not at crimes of the blackest die, when necessary to effect its wicked purposes.

In Africa and in Spain the Goths and Vandals were always engaged either in civil broils with one another, or in wars against the Romans. Great Britain, during the whole of this century, struggled for its liberty with the Saxons, Jutes, and Angles, who eventually established their empire (styled the Heptarchy from its famous partition into seven kingdoms) in that devoted island.

In this so general and violent perturbation of mankind, we may easily infer what must have been the decay of learning and science. The rude barbarians who had subjugated nations more polished than themselves, were indebted to their courage, and sometimes to their treachery, for success; and valued no other arts than those of managing with effect the buckler and the sword, or of dexterously outwitting their enemy: literature and the polite arts they left to men without courage, and esteemed them below the notice of warriors who had subdued the kingdoms of the West. Ignorance, of course, at the commencement of the sixth century, made rapid progress: whatever was not written in the vulgar rustic style became unintelligible to the public. Only in the towns where a bishop held his residence, and in the asylums of monastic perfection, were schools of literature and theology; and these solitary mansions were the retreat alike—of virtue, and of learning. Nor did the bishops

view with an eye of indifference—the unhappy ignorance of their pagan conquerors relative to religion; and they undertook to diffuse among them the light of faith. The barbarism of these people required, however, something more than mere human literature for their instruction;—something more striking to the senses. The Divine Goodness, in his views of mercy upon them, was pleased to make use of miracles, in order to work a salutary impression upon their mind. Of these a surprising number accordingly took place—at the tombs of St Martin, of St Germanus, and many other saints; prodigies so well attested, and in their nature so unequivocal, that the pastors of the church held them out to infidels as an undeniable and exclusive test of the true religion; the evidence of which, and of the striking interposition of Providence in other instances, effected the conversion of Clovis the Great, with the entire nation of the Franks.

However, we must not be surprised if, at this unenlightened epoch, we find false miracles blended with the true, and many fictitious narratives of prodigies, apparitions and revelations, which the shallow criticism of the times was not always qualified to detect: and as ignorance kept pace with the credulity of the age, certain practices of pagan origin were very generally adopted by the people. Some imagined, that a special Providence conducted the hand that casually opened any book of holy scripture; and that the first verse contained the solution of each perplexing difficulty. Adrian had formerly employed the *Æneid* for that purpose. King Chilperic gravely wrote a letter to St Martin, and caused it to be placed upon his tomb. In this letter he begged the saint to have the goodness to inform him—whether he could without a crime drag a certain person forcibly from his church, to which he had retired for protection!

Others were persuaded that Providence would not suffer perjury, falsehood, or any crime against which justice was demanded, to go unpunished; and that it would never permit the innocent to perish, in whatever awkward circumstances they might chance to be involved. Hence originated all those various kinds of ordeals—by water, by fire, by subjecting the parties to attest their innocence upon oath; by single combat, and the like; which superstitious methods of justification were termed—very improperly—the *judgment* of God.

Persons notoriously wicked, and those who were guilty of public crimes, when they wished to dive into futurity, or to escape condemnation, implored the aid of evil spirits in lieu of that of the saints: these had recourse to necromancy, magic and various kinds of witchcraft.

Such was the state of morality and of learning in the sixth age; while a multitude of frivolous disputes were agitated concerning religion. The errors of Arius, of Apollinaris, Nestorius and

Eutyches, had introduced into the study of theology the subtilities of dialectics; and by degrees, as ignorance gained ground, queries regarding the union of the divine and human nature—trifling in the extreme, not to say indelicate and disrespectful, became the matter of serious discussion. Thus, the Eutychians examined whether or not the body of our blessed Redeemer *transpired*, or whether it stood in need of nourishment: they divided upon these important questions; while one Timotheus was busily investigating, whether since the union of the divine and human nature, Jesus Christ could be ignorant of any thing. Some Scythian monks, with a view to explain in the clearest manner against the Nestorians—the union of the divine and human nature, insisted, that *one of the blessed Trinity had suffered*, and pretended it was necessary, that this proposition should be adopted as a rule of faith. Certain catholics, fearing it might be construed in favor of Eutychianism, rejected it. The clergy, the people, and the court, took part in this dispute. The emperor declared himself against the monks: they were patronized by Vitalian who had already protected the catholic cause against Anastasius. However, the use of the above proposition was eventually interdicted, as productive of commotion in the state and threatening the empire with civil war. On the other hand, from the proscription of the above proposition some inferred, that it was absolutely false; and that if it were true to say that one of the three Divine Persons had not suffered, it were likewise true to say that one of the Blessed Trinity did not become man, and consequently, that the Virgin Mary was not truly mother of God.

This was a consequence pregnant with still greater mischief than the proposition itself; and it was finally defined, that in fact *one of the blessed Trinity had suffered*.

When the Eutychian fanaticism began to subside, certain monks of Palestine gave much of their time to the perusal of the works of Origen, and adopted many of his errors. Other fellow monks warmly combated these errors; and the contest was attended with violent tumults throughout Palestine. The writings of Origen were condemned. The emperor Justinian, who was much too fond of interfering in ecclesiastical affairs, published an edict anathematizing Theodorus of Mopsuestia, together with his writings, those of Theodoret against St Cyril, and the letter of Ibas which had been read in the council of Chalcedon. This undue interference of the imperial authority was productive of much serious contestation in the church, and the violence of party. Nor was the point in contest authoritatively decided before the convocation of the fifth general council held at Constantinople in 553; when the writings above alluded to were finally proscribed, and are vulgarly denominated—The Three Chapters. They were, in fact, highly reprehensible: but

their authors, after signing a catholic formula of faith, had been admitted to communion by the council of Chalcedon—without a formal condemnation of the books in question. Hence originated the misunderstanding between catholics and the enemies of the Chalcedonian synod on this subject.

Semipelagianism, which had made some progress in Gaul, was condemned by the council of Orange; while the Franks, the Angles and the Saxons, embraced the christian religion; and the Goths, Sueves and Heruli, renounced Arianism. Thus the whole Western empire was catholic—in union with the holy see, and professed submission to the church of Rome;—a church which, in fact, had always borne a principal part in the conversion of infidels and heretics. In the very midst of the disorder and confusion which universally prevailed—the faith of this catholic church was pure as its morality; error, abuses and deordination of every kind, it equally reprov'd. Of this the decrees of councils and ecclesiastic canons bear unquestionable evidence: every where it hath produced men illustrious for sanctity, and virtues no where else to be found: religion alone hath rescued us from the frightful state of barbarism in which those savage tribes, who invaded and destroyed the empire of the West, were originally engulfed; religion alone hath made the difference.

Seventh century of the christian era.

At the commencement of the seventh age reigned Phocas,—a tyrant possessed of every vice which can reflect disgrace upon humanity, without one single desirable quality to countervene the general depravity of his heart. While this wretch was amusing himself with the ruin of his subjects and the effusion of their blood, the barbarians on their side overran the territories of the empire, and filled them with carnage and desolation. Heraclius stept forth, and delivered the state from both its internal and external foes. He wrested the provinces out of the hands of the Persians, and spread the terror of his arms from the East to the West. The empire of Constantinople still comprised a part of Italy, Greece, Thrace, Mesopotamia and Syria;—Palestine, Egypt and Africa: but these vast domains had been depopulated by the continual wars which the empire had to sustain;—the ravages of barbarians;—the absolute and arbitrary power of cruel and avaricious governors; and the extreme severity of the imperial edicts against every denomination of sectarists. The subjects that still remained, groaned under the weight of oppression; and the empire could no longer be considered by any as their native country. Thus, in order to effect its entire destruction—a catastrophe which had already taken place in regard of

the western provinces, nothing was now wanted but a people moderately powerful, to attempt it. Such a state the emperors themselves had long been gradually forming. In the midst of the wars which desolated the rest of mankind, the Arabians had enjoyed their liberty in peace. With them, had taken refuge the disaffected and the unfortunate, and all the sectaries proscribed by the impolitic ordinances of the empire, from Constantine to Heraclius. They allowed to all the unrestricted liberty of practising their religion. *There* was a confused medley of idolaters, Jews and christians, together with the various sects which had appeared since the first commencement of christianity. The love of liberty and independence had hitherto kept them disunited. Upon two articles—all, except the idolaters, were agreed; namely, that there was but one God, and that Jesus Christ had been sent into the world to make him known, and to deliver unto men the rules of perfect morality. Mahomet undertook to reduce christianity to these two points—with a view to reunite all the christians of Arabia in one common league against catholicity. He had all the necessary qualifications for such an undertaking: he was possessed of a strong imagination; was naturally inclined to fanaticism,—ambitious, and of a hot and fiery temper. He saw the absurdity of idol-worship, and was easily persuaded that he had a commission from Almighty God to teach men a pure religion, which, he fancied, was revealed in a special manner to himself. His mercantile profession made him known to the christians of Syria, to those of the East, and his native country Arabia. He declared himself the reformer of christianity, and pretended that the angel Gabriel had appeared to him, and commanded him to teach the tribe to which he belonged—the unity of God, and the perfect rules of moral virtue. He gave it out, that he had been favored with wonderful ecstasies; communicated his enthusiasm to the ignorant, by promising those that should receive his doctrine, the most magnificent rewards; and described to them in the most lively colours, the delights reserved in paradise for true believers. A small number actually believed him to be inspired, and seriously embraced his doctrine; while others called in question his pretended mission, and obliged him to consult his safety by flight. After encountering and surmounting many difficulties, he was at length received by his own tribe as a prophet and an apostle sent of God. His eventual success, his natural fanaticism, and the obstacles themselves with which he had to struggle, enlarged his views and augmented his temerity. He now conceived the vast project of subjecting every tribe, and all the nations of the earth, to his new invented code of superstition.

It was Mahomet's plan to effect his purposes by force of arms. His disciples were trained up to the art of war, as became the

apostles of blood. "I myself," said Ali to him, when he took the oath of fidelity, "even I will be thy minister; I will break the teeth, I will tear out the eyes, I will rip up the belly of those that shall oppose thee." Mahomet promised paradise to such as should die fighting for his religion; and, within less than ten years he united in his cause all the Arabian tribes; received embassies from all the sovereigns of the peninsula; sent his apostles and lieutenants into distant countries, and wrote to the Roman emperor Heraclius, and to the king of Persia, in order to engage them to embrace his new religion.

Abubeker, who succeeded Mahomet, having annihilated the factions of other impostors like himself, bent the whole energy of his Arabs against the neighbouring states. He wrote to the princes of Hiemen, the chiefs of Meccha, and Mussulmans throughout the whole extent of Arabia, to muster the greatest number possible of troops, and march them to Medina. "I am going," says he to them, "to deliver Syria out of the hands of infidels; and I wish you to understand, that in combating for our religion, you obey the order of God." Presently a prodigious multitude of Arabians assemble at Medina,—destitute of the means of subsistence, but ready with cheerful hearts, and without a murmur, to march in any direction the moment that the army should be completed. He sent them against the Greeks and Persians; and before the death of Omar, who succeeded Abubeker, they had subjugated a part of Persia; made settlements in Africa, and in Egypt; demolished four thousand temples—of idolaters, christians and Persians; and erected, during His reign alone, fourteen hundred mosques. Under Omar's successor Othman, the whole of Persia submitted to the Arabs; and the king of Nubia was made tributary to this calif. Under Ali civil broils and intestine divisions interrupted for a while the rapidity of their conquests. Moavia found means to re-unite them; and caused a traditionary notion to be spread abroad, importing that the Mussulmans were destined to reduce the capital of the Cesars, and that those who should be employed in the siege, were to receive a full and absolute pardon of all their sins. The Mahometans flocked from all quarters to the standard of the calif, unintimidated by the perils, and unbroken by the hardships of the enterprise; which, however, did not succeed according to their expectations. In vain, notwithstanding, did Heraclius endeavour to stem the career of his formidable enemies; and Constantine his son was compelled to cede to them the provinces which they had seized, on condition only, that they should allow him a certain tribute by way of compromise.

Jyazid, the succeeding calif, followed up his conquests in the East, subdued Korazan, and laid the territories of the prince of Samarcand under contribution, although the Arabians were

still at variance among themselves. The Constantinopolitan emperors were yet in possession of some territory in Italy, while the Lombards occupied the most considerable part. That portion of Italy subject to the Eastern empire was divided into duchies dependant on the exarchs of Ravenna, as the exarch himself was upon the emperor. Each, however, of these petty powers was ambitious to assert their independence. The Lombards, in their turn, neglected no opportunity of aggrandisement, and rendered abortive all the efforts of the Eastern emperors, to re-establish their authority in Italy. France was portioned out into provinces, the chiefs or kings of which at first carried on a cruel war against each other, and then abandoned themselves without reserve to the pursuit of pleasure, indulged in effeminacy and sloth, and left the charge of government to a minister of state, designated by the title of Mayor of the Palace. In Spain, the sovereign power gradually devolved on those of the nobility, whom their fellow nobles thought fit to invest with regal dignity. These haughty and ambitious noblemen were much addicted to faction and intrigue, and not unfrequently assassinated their sovereigns, and usurped their throne. Thus, no less than fourteen kings reigned in their turn in Spain, during the course of this century; and of that number one half were dethroned, or murdered by the traitorous hands of unprincipled usurpers. Religious zeal was sometimes alleged as the motive or pretext of these conspirators. Almost all of them assembled councils to procure the condemnation of their predecessors, and to justify their own intrusion. Hence, during the lapse of this one century, were held nineteen synods in Spain alone.

In these synods, it is true, many wise and useful regulations were adopted relative to morality and social life. They excommunicate those subjects who scruple not to violate their allegiance to their sovereign; while they earnestly exhort all kings to govern with justice, and with piety: against those who should abuse their power to the committing of evil, they solemnly denounce anathema.

The Saxons who had conquered England, had apportioned it into seven kingdoms; but their kings were perpetually at war, until, happily for their subjects and themselves, they all embraced the christian religion. Many monasteries of men and religious retreats for nuns were established and endowed by these princes, with a liberality truly royal; and some of them exchanged their sceptres for the silence and retirement of these asylums of perfect virtue.

The general state of literature and the polite arts continued to decline: while religious fanaticism, in the East, and an undiscerning partiality for the marvellous, had absorbed almost all the faculties of the human mind, in the West, the continual

wars of ferocious barbarians had left no leisure for the cultivation of science. Religion alone afforded a proper antidote against the pressure of such evils. The zeal and piety of the bishops, the sacerdotal order, and the monks, had in part relieved the unfortunate, consoled the miserable, and arrested the fury of savage conquerors, who notwithstanding their ferocity could not deny respect to virtue, nor hear without dismay the chastisements denounced against them—of a future world. The bishops remarked it; and, in union with the clergy and the monks, they turned their whole attention towards piety, and the practice of virtues the best calculated—to make a wholesome impression upon the minds of the haughty conquerors of the West;—to render the christian religion recommendable;—to allure them to the observance of its precepts, and to rescue them from the tyranny of their furious passions. At length, however, the necessity of self-defence against fresh invaders, forced even churchmen to fly to arms; and thus, becoming warriors themselves, they many of them relapsed into a state of ignorance and barbarism not much inferior to that of their oppressors.

Religion, notwithstanding, still opposed a powerful barrier to the passions, to ignorance and incivilization: she alone produced those striking instances of virtue which still appeared upon the earth; she alone afforded to letters and the sciences those sacred retreats where they labored in silence to soften the manners, and to enlighten the understanding of the ignorant—by forming a multitude of admirable characters, whose virtues secured to them the confidence of the sovereign and the veneration of the people; and whose lights were equally useful to them both. Such, for instance, were many popes and bishops; St Gregory the Great, St Leo II, St Isidore, St Julian of Toledo, St Sulpicius, St Columban and others, who almost every where established monasteries, and schools of piety and learning.

The church had defined—against Nestorius, that in Jesus Christ there was but one person; and, against Eutyches, it taught two distinct natures. The Eutychians pretended, that their doctrine could not be condemned by the church, without admitting with the Nestorians two distinct persons in Christ; the Nestorians on the contrary, maintained, that in condemning Nestorius, the church had fallen into Sabellianism, and had confounded, with Eutyches, the divine and human nature. The difficulty then was, to explain how two distinct natures could subsist in one and the self same person. Some would have it, that in Jesus Christ the Word was the only active principle, and that the human will was absolutely passive, like an instrument in the hands of the artist. Heraclius, struck with this erroneous idea, assembled a council, and then caused an edict to be published in which Monothelitism, or the error which implies only one will in Christ, was made a rule of faith, and established by

an imperial law. Thus did that prince forfeit the glory which he had acquired by his victories, for the imaginary honor of dictating to the church a new article of faith, and of forcing upon the consciences of his subjects the innovating doctrine contained in his expository edict termed the *Ecthesis*. All his successors a long time after busied themselves in defending or opposing the Monothelite heresy, while the provinces groaned under the oppression of their governors and the collectors-general of the imperial taxes, and were continually exposed to the inroads of barbarians, who poured into the empire on every side like an impetuous and overwhelming torrent.

In this century also, a certain Manichean devotee in her retreat among the mountains of Armenia, inspired her son with the enthusiastic ambition of becoming the apostle of her sect: from him his proselytes and the entire sect received the denomination of Paulicians. Paul was succeeded by Sylvanus, who undertook to reform the Manichean system, and to reconcile the doctrine of two principles with holy scripture, and, like the reformers of the present times, affected to adopt scripture alone for his rule of faith. Like them he accused the catholics of idolatry, and of adoring the saints as so many divinities. His morals were austere; and many among the ignorant were taught to consider this new-modelled sect as a society of perfect christians. Thus the Paulicians multiplied prodigiously in the seventh age.

Eighth century of the christian era.

The empire of the Califs was indisputably the most powerful monarchy of any in the East: it extended from Canton in China, to the southern extremities of Spain, and comprised within its boundaries many provinces which constituted heretofore a part of the Constantinopolitan empire. The governors of the conquered provinces, who at first had treated them with mildness, afterwards became their tyrants; and the ambitious and the disaffected failed not to improve the general discontent into open rebellion; which was not quelled without great difficulty, and much loss of blood. The conquest of Spain, and the inroads of the conquerors into Gaul, cost the lives of an infinite number of Arabs, Goths and Franks: while the empire of Constantinople lay exposed to the depredations—in their turns—of Goths, Huns, Saracens and Lombards; and was moreover torn in pieces by domestic faction. Justinian who had been expelled his own dominions towards the close of the seventh century, was re-established upon the throne at the commencement of the eighth, and, eight years afterwards, was put to death. Philippicus who superseded him, was deposed in his turn. Anastasius his successor, was thrust into a monastery by Theodosius

III. whom the people compelled to accept the empire, and whom Leo the Isaurian despoiled of his imperial diadem, which he had assumed against his will. Leo reigned twenty years, and Constantine Copronymus twenty-four. His son Leo reigned but three. Constantine Porphyrogenitus, after a reign of seventeen years, was assassinated; his mother Irene was deposed after a short reign of five. Almost all the emperors that wore the purple in the eighth century, without attending much to the disorders of the state, labored very industriously either to enforce some erroneous doctrine regarding faith, adopted by themselves; or, more laudably, to restore tranquillity to the church. Philippicus, for instance, was hardly seated on the throne, when he converted his whole attention towards the establishment of Monothelitism. Leo the Isaurian, and Constantine Copronymus, were equally industrious in prohibiting the veneration paid to sacred images in the church; and Irene with no less eagerness set herself to re-establish it. The edict of Leo the Isaurian against holy images, produced some insurrections in Italy; of which the Lombards availed themselves with a view to their own aggrandizement.

Pope Gregory II. issued a brief of excommunication against the exarch of Ravenna, who attempted to enforce the execution of the imperial edict; and wrote to Luitprand, to the Venetians, and to all the principal cities of Italy, to exhort them to persevere stedfastly in the faith. Almost all appeared on the eve of insurrection and of open rebellion, which the holy pontiff sought in vain to tranquillize; and the whole disposable force of the Eastern empire was transported into Italy. Rome successively owed its deliverance, first, to Luitprand, and then, to the renowned Charles Martel, by whom the imperialists were compelled once for all to fall back upon Ravenna. Under the conduct of Astolphus, the Lombards possessed themselves of the exarchate itself, and subsequently undertook the conquest of Rome. Pepin, second son to Charles Martel, relieved Rome, and rescued it from the tyranny of the Lombards, under the popedom of Zachary and Stephen. The church of Rome had never received a more noble donation than that which the piety of this prince now made it, namely, of the territory which he had conquered from the Lombards. Pepin smiled at the pretensions of Copronymus, who had the assurance to demand that these conquests should be restored to him; although, after repeated applications for assistance against the Lombards, he had not been able to protect them from their fury, and had left them to their fate. This noble act of generosity, and other signal services, obtained for Pepin the honourable epithet of protector of the Roman people, and defender of the church of Rome;—a title which became hereditary in his family, and appropriate to the kings of France. Pepin himself had been raised to the throne by the election of the states general, and was crowned by St Boniface the apostle of Germany,

and now a second time by Pope Stephen, at his own request. Rome was once more threatened by the Lombards, during the pontificate of Adrian, who implored the aid of Charlemagne against these warlike and ambitious neighbours. Charlemagne marched against the Lombards; annihilated their dynasty in Italy; confirmed the donations made by Pepin his father to the church; and was crowned by Pope Leo III. emperor of the West.

This prince extended his empire from the Ebro to the Vistula, over a vast variety of uncivilized nations and savage tribes,—devoid alike of every principle of religion and of justice;—habituated to a life of rapine and every species of licentiousness;—ever ready to rise against their conquerors in despite of the most solemn treaties, and the most sacred engagements. The profound policy of Charlemagne, in order to enforce obedience to his laws, combined the powerful persuasives of religion with compulsive measures, and the terror of his arms; while his vigilance and activity, joined with a spirit of heroism and an admirable discipline which reigned throughout his army, kept his foreign enemies in awe.

England was in a state of distraction—under sovereigns who knew no other laws than those of their respective passions, and were always in arms. Religion alone was able to set bounds to their lawless career; and only christian charity was qualified to soften their ferocious dispositions into mildness, and the peaceable forbearance of the gospel. To effect this, was the object of certain truly apostolical men, who laboured with success to civilize the nation, and to establish in it the faith of Christ.

Spain, at the commencement of this century, was governed by a set of kings who abused their authority—to the oppression of their subjects. One of these invited the Saracens into Spain; and they were joined by the disaffected natives. Roderic, the then reigning prince, was defeated; and his territories were annexed to the dominions of the califs, who extended their conquests even into Gaul; whence, however, they were soon expelled by the extraordinary valour of Charles Martel, and afterwards by Charlemagne. Certain Spanish fugitives in the mountains, animated by the heroism of the renowned Pelagius, gradually became formidable to the Saracens. With the aid of Charlemagne, they arrested the progress of their arms in Spain, and eventually effected their destruction.

Literature, in the early part of this century, was still in a state of the utmost depression. At the birth of Mahometism, the Mussulmans declared war indiscriminately—against all that refused to embrace their superstition: the vanquished they condemned to die. But after the first transports of their enthusiasm had subsided, they mitigated the excessive cruelty of so impolitic a maxim, and for fear of changing their new-acquired ter-

ritories into one vast wilderness of destruction, they granted a kind of toleration to all religions, with the exception only—of gross idolatry. This indulgence caused great multitudes of christians, Jews, and other persons instructed in the arts and sciences, to settle in the dominions of the califs; where they continued in secret to improve themselves in learning, during the reign of the Ommiades, till the accession of Almansor. This prince, and his immediate successors, encouraged letters and learned men; while the emperors of Constantinople were wholly employed in compelling their subjects to adopt their respective innovations relative to faith, or in reconciling systems of belief absolutely inconsistent with each other. Among the few ecclesiastical writers of the eighth age, St John Damascen is almost the only one remarkable either for method, erudition or genius.

Since the invasion of the Lombards, Italy had been appor-tioned into petty sovereignties, whose chiefs were incessantly engaged in enterprises of aggrandizement, or in measures of self-defence. The subject groaned under the oppressive yoke of tyrants; and science and morality were alike neglected throughout Italy in these evil times. Only the popes, the bishops, and the clergy, still laboured in the acquirement of useful knowledge, and exerted themselves in promoting sound morality;—in restraining the passions by the salutary dread of future punishment, and in making religion respectable by the edifying regularity of its ministers, and the august apparatus of its ceremonies—well calculated, especially in an age like the one in question—ignorant and superstitious—to inspire the most brutal minds with religious awe, and to give a check to passions even the most impatient of control.

In France, the arts and sciences which had taken refuge in the monasteries, were now banished from these sacred asylums. The tyranny of the mayors of the palace; the wars of Charles Martel, and the licentiousness of the soldiery, filled every place with tumult and devastation. Ecclesiastic property was distributed by that martial prince amongst his favourite generals, who, instead of providing for the subsistence of a competent number of clergy to serve the churches, filled their colleges and the monasteries with soldiers. The monks and clerical men, thus compelled to live with the military, gradually imbibed their spirit, and at length were glad to serve in the armies, as the only expedient left to save their revenues. Ignorance and vice, of course, became almost general; and towards the middle of the eighth century, hardly was there left in France, and indeed in the whole continent of Europe, the smallest vestige of the fine arts; and the monks and ecclesiastics themselves, with some few exceptions, were scarcely qualified to read a short lesson to their people. England and Ireland were now, almost

exclusively, the seats of learning and true piety. In the midst of this obscure night, the enlightened and comprehensive mind of Charlemagne, for the good of humanity and to the immortal glory of his reign, formed the project of dissipating ignorance, and furnishing his subjects with the means of instruction. He established schools in the towns, boroughs, and villages throughout his vast domain, for the gratuitous education of children and the ignorant—of every description: he wrote to all the bishops and abbots, exhorting them to erect schools or universities in their respective cathedrals and abbeys, for the laudable purpose of teaching there the liberal arts and sciences. He studied them with diligence himself, and invited into France the most celebrated scholars of the age;—such were, for instance,—Alcuin of York, Clement, Walnefride and others, whom he employed with success in the literary regeneration of Europe. This, however, was to be the work of time; and the life of one man is not sufficient to complete a task which the degeneracy of whole preceding ages has been gradually increasing.

But in the almost universal decline of intellectual improvement, the church of God still preserved its doctrine and its morality unsullied. All its councils, and the authority of history, with one accord attest this truth. We behold it with equal energy and wisdom proscribing the impious reveries of an Adelbert, and the wrangling incredulity of Clement, and of men who, like Clement, rejected the authority of councils and the Fathers, and attacked the dogma of predestination, and the discipline and morality of the church itself. Felix of Urgel pretended, that Jesus Christ was not the natural, but only the *adoptive* Son of God. Both Felix and Clement were condemned, and solidly refuted.

Thus in the midst of the disorders, and of the profound darkness which seemed to reign over the earth, the bishops, entrusted with the depositum of faith, continued to preserve unaltered the doctrine of Jesus Christ;—his morality, and the form of worship which he had established in his church.

Ninth century.

The Saracen was still the ruling power; but was often paralyzed by a spirit of sedition and revolt. The califs became at length indolent and voluptuous, and left the burden of government to the captain of their body guards, which consisted of mercenary Turks. This Turkish chief, together with the leading men at court, disposed at pleasure of the dignities of the state, and ere long, of the persons of the califs too, whom by turns they wantonly deposed, massacred, or raised to the honorary title, as they thought fit. The Arabs likewise began now to degenerate from

their primitive hardiness and valor; and the neighbouring nations and Greeks made frequent inroads into their territories.

In the Greek empire, as in that of the Saracens during the ninth century, nothing was more common than to behold emperors—raised to the throne and deposed again, by faction;—to see the empire perpetually insulted by barbarians, while the emperors were solely occupied in abolishing or in re-establishing the veneration of holy images. In the West, Charlemagne survived, for the happiness of his people, four years longer;—honored and adored by his subjects, and revered by all the neighbouring powers. His son Lewis Debonnaire, or the *good-natured*, with some excellent dispositions joined also great defects. His own children rose up against him, and by the aid of intrigue and the violence of faction, procured repeatedly his deposition from the throne, to which he was as often with equal fickleness restored. His graceless sons divided the empire, and formed of it three independent monarchies;—Italy, France and Germany. None of the great qualities of Charlemagne were discernible in them, or in any of their posterity—a race without genius, without talents, and almost invariably—without virtue. The three kingdoms were incessantly at variance with each other, and were torn in pieces with civil discord; while all the neighbouring nations,—the Danes, the Normans, the Saracens, inundated on every side the provinces which had constituted the bulk of the western empire. The noble plan of government established by Charlemagne, disappeared; the laws were without energy, and the people without principle or discernment. Only the popes and conscientious pastors asserted aloud the common rights of humanity in favor of the oppressed: they alone were qualified by their virtue and the salutary threats of the Divine vengeance—to oppose a strong barrier to lawless power: and notwithstanding the horrible licentiousness of the age, the dread of chastisement in the world to come terrified the most reprobate hearts, and forced them to have recourse to the pastors of the church and to religion; in order to appease the awful bodings of a troubled conscience. In these moments of serious reflection, they often referred their respective claims to the decision of the bishops, and joined with them in promoting the reform of abuses both in church and state. All the councils celebrated during the ninth century are full of exhortations, or of threats of the Divine judgments denounced against those sovereigns who disturbed the public peace, and abused their authority to the prejudice of the people, and the immunities of the church. They placed before the eyes of kings and potentates the awful moment of dissolution; and their pious remonstrances frequently produced the most admirable effects. The clergy, therefore, and the prelates of the church, notwithstanding the irregularities of some of their body, were the sole protectors of the common cause of

humanity; without their aid, and that of religion, every idea of justice and of moral virtue, must have been obliterated in the western empire.

At the commencement of the ninth century, Egbert was sole monarch over all England; whose successors down to Alfred the Great were princes, sometimes indeed pious and religious, but uniformly deficient in point of vigor and activity. Meanwhile the Danes made frequent descents upon the island; penetrated into the interior of the kingdom, and established settlements in the midst of it; while fresh disembarkations poured in in every direction, and made the coast a wilderness, and the whole nation desolate. Alfred the Great had these furious enemies to contend with during almost the whole period of his reign; and it was not before the close of his administration, that he effected the complete deliverance of England, by establishing a navy to cruise along the coast, which totally annihilated the Danish fleets.

The Saracen califs continued to patronise learning, and particularly the science of astronomy. This produced a great number of proficients in that noble and not less eminently useful branch of knowledge, some of whom have left behind them astronomical observations surprisingly exact. Many also applied themselves to the study of judicial astrology, while in other departments of literature they confined themselves more successfully to the traduction and explanation of ancient authors who heretofore had discussed them. On the contrary, in the Constantinopolitan empire the liberal arts were much neglected and despised. Leo the Isaurian had destroyed all the establishments favorable to literature; and the learned were consigned to oblivion and contempt. It was owing to the efforts of the Saracen calif Amon to attract Leo the philosopher to his court, that the emperor Theophilus first discovered the treasure which he possessed in this great man. He encouraged his talents, and rendered them important to the state, by entrusting him with the charge of public instruction. Bardas, who governed under the emperor Michael, undertook with the aid and advice of Photius, to revive learning in the eastern empire, by establishing professors of all the sciences and polite arts, and attaching to their functions both honorary privileges and regular pecuniary appointments. This was soon followed with the desired success; although, by the monuments still extant—of the literary exertions of this period, it appears, that the men of letters studied only to imitate and expound the ancients.

In the West, sacred and profane learning continued to be taught in the prodigious number of schools established and endowed by Charlemagne; till the dreadful disorders of the succeeding reigns once more ushered in an obscure night of ignorance and barbarism, save only in the monasteries and cathe-

drals. The incursions of the Danes, and the ravages of civil war, had almost utterly exterminated letters and the fine arts, and had destroyed nearly all the schools of education in England. More than half the century had thus elapsed, when Alfred began to communicate to his subjects his own mental acquirements, by the diffusion of learning throughout the provinces of Great Britain. He was a prince of untarnished character, possessed of every quality calculated to make a sovereign the object of adoration to his people. He was, moreover, a good architect, geometrician, philosopher and historian. Piety had converted all his efforts and all the resources of his genius and learning—to promote the general good of his fellow-creatures. To him England is indebted for a great part of those wise laws, which form at present the happiness of our constitution. Every where he established schools of theology, of arithmetic, of music and astronomy; and invited from foreign countries learned men of every description, and the most celebrated artists of every kind. In a word, he spared neither cost nor pains to inspire the English nation with a love of literature, religion and the sciences. To him also, we owe the establishment of our marine,—with many valuable privileges appertaining to the birthright of an Englishman. Widely different was the conduct of those worthless sovereigns who reigned at Constantinople, during the ninth age. Leo the Isaurian, Michael the Big, and Theophilus, all alike abused their authority—by persecuting the church of God, and prohibiting the relative veneration which it thought good to decree to holy images; till the empress Theodora enforced by law the second council of Nice, and effectually suppressed the fanaticism of the Iconoclasts. This princess treated the Manichees with still greater rigor. Above one hundred thousand of these deluded people perished by various kinds of punishments. Such of them as had the good fortune to escape, joined the Saracens in their inroads into the territories of the empire; fortified some places where their persecuted fellow-sectaries might find a secure retreat; and with them soon formed an army—formidable both for its numbers, and for that furious spirit of animosity with which it was inflamed—against the emperors, and against every individual professor of the catholic religion. They committed dreadful depredations in the provinces of the empire, and more than once annihilated its armies. At length, however, their fate was decided by a general battle, in which their leader fell; and with him was dissipated in a moment that powerful combination which the excess of rigorism had formed, and which had shaken to its centre the Constantinopolitan empire.

After Theodora had resigned the regency to her unnatural son Michael III. surnamed the Drunkard, his uncle Bardas became prime minister, and ruled with despotic authority in his

name. This man divorced his lawful wife, and contracted an incestuous marriage with his daughter-in-law, notwithstanding the zealous remonstrances and ecclesiastic censures of the patriarch Ignatius. Him Bardas caused to be deposed, and intruded Photius in his place. The intruded prelate was excommunicated by the pope; and a schism ensued between the Greek and Latin churches, which was not terminated till the meeting of the eighth general council.

In this age Godescalcus raised long and warm debates concerning predestination; and a monk of Corby, from some passages in St Augustine, affected to infer, that all mankind collectively had but one individual soul. A priest of Mentz maintained with much zeal, that Cicero and Virgil were saved; and a visionary devotee pretended to discover in the Revelations, like some of the canting prophets of the present day, that the dissolution of the world would take place precisely in the year 848. Like them she thought she had received a commission from above to announce this grand discovery to mankind. She did so; and found many fools prepared to give her full credit for her prediction!

Tenth century.

The empire of the Mussulmans was now divided into a vast number of governments, over which the calif had no longer any absolute control. A croud of impostors had followed the example of Mahomet, and wished themselves to share with him a part of the national enthusiasm. The califs, who formerly went clad in the skins of beasts, and used the most simple diet, were grown luxurious and effeminate, and had a train of not less than forty thousand domestics. In the midst of this grand equipage, they oftentimes fell victims to the caprice of the soldiery, the treachery of favorites, or the ambition of competitors. Their prime ministers exercised all the functions of sovereignty, while the califs themselves were content with a sort of religious pre-eminence, and had no share in the government of the state.

Leo the philosopher reigned at Constantinople in the beginning of the tenth age. He was succeeded by his son Alexander, whose excesses quickly rid the empire of a most vicious prince. His nephew Constantine, Romanus compelled to take him for his colleague; and the son of Romanus dethroned his own father, and in his turn was himself dethroned, and forced to embrace an ecclesiastical state. Constantine recovered his authority, but was taken off by a most nefarious conspiracy of his own unnatural son Romanus, who at the suggestion of his not less wicked wife, administered a dose of poison to his royal father. This parricide did not long enjoy the fruits of his impiety. The army

proclaimed their general Nicephorus emperor; and he, too, was constrained to give place to Zimisce. The tranquillity of this prince's reign was disturbed by frequent conspiracies, and the rebellion of many provinces which the rapacious conduct of the eunuch Basil, chief minister of state, had driven into insurrection. Basil, dreading the justice of Zimisce, contrived his death by poison, and governed with despotic authority under the sons of Romanus, Constantine and Basil whom Zimisce had appointed to succeed him in the empire. Their reign, like the former, was troubled with revolt and civil war.

Italy, France and Germany were constantly engaged in foreign or domestic wars. In Italy, the different factions invited to their aid the neighbouring princes, and not unfrequently,—barbarians; and, as their new guests oftentimes became troublesome, others were called in to expel them, and became in their turn also, equally untractable. In this turbulent state of things, John XII. invited Otho into Italy, who extinguished the flames of discord among the natives,—wrested from the Greeks Apulia and Calabria, and reunited Italy to the Germanic empire. France was exposed to the incursions of the Normans, in whose favor Charles the Simple ceded a part of Neustria, which from them is still called Normandy. The disaffected nobles abandoned Charles, and placed Robert, son of Eudes, upon the throne: the two rivals formed confederacies with their neighbours. But, after the death of Robert, the states elected Raoul for their king; and Charles, now forsaken by all his adherents, died in duress at Peronne. After Raoul's demise, Hugues, Count of Paris and of Orleans, recalled Lewis son to Charles the Simple, who upon his father's disgrace had taken refuge in Great Britain. Lewis wished to check the overgrown influence of the barons, and with this view entered into league with the neighbouring powers. The nobles invited to their assistance the Bulgarians and the Normans; and France was left a prey to the fury of civil contention, when Lotharius succeeded to the crown. He was an enterprising and successful prince, but treacherous and faithless. He fell by poison in the midst of the tumults and disorders of the state. His son Lewis reigned nineteen years, and was succeeded by Hugues Capet the head of the Bourbon family. During the preceding reigns the vassals of the crown were become so powerful, that each noble had his fortresses and his castles, situated for the most part upon eminences, and overawing the surrounding plains. They even laid all travellers and merchants under contribution, and imposed upon them at pleasure arbitrary tolls by way of tribute, before they were permitted to cross any river; the fords of which they caused to be diligently guarded. Against these petty tyrants Hugues Capet waged a successful war.

In Germany the order of things was much the same. The

great were always in arms one against the other, or else at war with their sovereigns. These latter, too, when unembarrassed at home with civil broils, became parties in the quarrels of their neighbours; so that Germany scarce enjoyed any intervals of peace. Nor was England more privileged than the nations of the continent; it was generally harassed by the inroads of the Danes, or implicated in domestic feuds.

Learning was still patronised in the East by the Saracen califs, and by the sultans who had usurped the greatest part of their authority. A considerable proportion of their learned men were employed in translating into the Arabic tongue the writings of the ancient philosophers; while others applied themselves with much diligence to the study of the translations already set forth in the preceding age. Some, again, gave comments on the works of Aristotle and other celebrated authors of antiquity, or presented the public with a choice collection of their most admired axioms. Among the Mussulman theologians was formed—a society of literati who maintained, that in order to attain perfection, it was absolutely necessary to join philosophy with the study of the alcoran. This new system of philosophico-theologism was an innovation in the doctrine of Mahometism; and, in fact, the Mussulmans had now their Predeterminians, their Pelagians, their Optimists, their Origenists; besides a vast variety of theologists who controverted the general and received laws of morality, and those of natural philosophy: some likewise pretended, that every Mussulman would infallibly be saved. Others held, that the Divinity resided in all men; and in Ali, in a very special manner; in a word, they believed him to be God incarnate.

In the Constantinopolitan empire, Bardas, encouraged by the example of the Arabians, and by the exhortations of Photius, had begun to revive the study of literature and the sciences, towards the close of the last century: his views were seconded by Constantine Porphyrogenitus, who invited from all quarters—philosophers, geometricians and astronomers, to come and teach at Constantinople. But from the depth of ignorance to the perfection of science, the progression is but gradual; and we do not find that the Greek empire produced any celebrated writers during the tenth century. An undiscerning relish for the marvellous was the order of the day; and this, perhaps, it was, that determined Metaphrastes to compile his *Legends of the Saints*;—a publication replete with the most extraordinary prodigies, ill authenticated at the best, and often supposititious.

Europe, as already observed, was agitated with perpetual wars. The fury of arms had produced a general licentiousness; inflamed the passions; extinguished in many almost the light of reason itself. Still, however, there were many that retained

impressions of religion even in their greatest excesses. Virtuous persons availed themselves of these precious remnants of faith—to represent to them in lively colours the dreadful chastisements reserved for wicked actors, in a future state. Often the agonies of remorse compelled these latter to adopt the severest methods of expiating their crimes, and frequently too, their consummate impiety hurried them into the superstitious practices—of augury and every species of divination, and other vain observances which had been in use with idolaters in preceding ages. Some ignorant and simple people had strange ideas with reference to the other world, and imagined, for instance, that it was a part of St Michael's office to sing high mass in heaven every Monday. The tenth age, notwithstanding, so fruitful in other evils of every description, gave not birth to any new heresy.

Eleventh century of the christian era.

The Mahometan empire was still under the nominal government of the califs, who in fact were but the phantoms of imperial authority, while their sultans ruled with arbitrary sway. Mahmoud, sultan of Bagdad, subjugated India,—established in those vast regions the religion of Mahomet, and caused above fifty thousand poor idolaters to be massacred in cold blood. While this sultan was thus busied in extending the boundaries of the Mussulman empire and superstition, the Seleucidæ, a warlike nation of the Turks, made themselves masters of several provinces hitherto subject to the jurisdiction of the sultans. The calif had invited them to rid him of the tyranny of Mahmoud, and declared their chief imperial viceroy over all the nations which God had entrusted to his charge;—king of the East and of the West. His successors added new acquisitions to his immense domains, waged a long and cruel war against the Constantinopolitan empire, and subdued Georgia; extending their dominion from Syria to the Bosphorus. The emperor Basil, who had prosecuted with vigor the re-establishment of the Eastern empire, was succeeded by his son Constantine. This prince, the more freely to indulge a voluptuous disposition, resigned the government of the state wholly to his ministers. By these—all former merit was rewarded with loss of office, or with death. During the entire lapse of the eleventh age—treachery, poison, and parricide, were the means ordinarily employed in the advancement or the deposition of an emperor. Hence we may easily form an idea of the disorders of the government, and of the deplorable condition of the people; who were, moreover, daily exposed to the incursions of the Bulgarians, Saracens and Turks. These barbarians must inevitably have even now re-

duced the Constantinopolitan empire, had they not been frequently at variance among themselves. Nor was the Western atmosphere less turbid and tempestuous. From time to time indeed, it was partially illumined with the virtues and elevated genius of enlightened sovereigns; but these were not able, with their utmost efforts, to re-establish order; nor could they impart their virtues and their talents to those who were to wear the diadem when they should be no more. Gregory VII. was aware of this, and observed with sorrow the mischievous effects of power abused. He formed the project—novel, it must be owned, and equally unwarranted in the means to be employed—of subjecting this power to the laws of christianity. This, he conceived, could not be otherwise effected but by the spiritual arms of the visible Head of the church, and the terrors of excommunication, attended with whatever might render them more imposing to the objects of ecclesiastical censure. His own virtue, and his ardent zeal did not permit him to foresee, that the Heads of the church themselves, who hitherto, in general, had deserved so well of christianity, might one day unworthily abuse that immense power thus to be transferred to the Roman pontiffs. He contemplated no other result from this mighty influence, than a certain antidote to the evils which desolated Europe. His motive was good, his warmest adversaries will readily allow; but his reasoning was inconclusive and fallacious, and his deductions wrong. However, to him they appeared accurate; and the ignorance of the times was not competent distinctly to ascertain the exact boundaries of ecclesiastical authority. Hence a prince excommunicated by the pope, was in consequence reputed no better than a tyrant;—a declared enemy of the church,—a reprobate wholly possessed by Satan. Thus, the sentence of the pontiff-deposing kings, and the excommunication which deprived them of the common rites of christianity, were by the ignorant received as oracles; and to sovereigns they were dreadful as the thunderbolt.

In this age, pilgrimages to the Holy Land were frequent; and the pilgrims were exposed to the attacks and insults of the Turks, who had possessed themselves of Palestine. On their return they delineated in the most lively colours the hardships which they had undergone, and the deplorable state of christians in that devoted country. The sovereign pontiff, moved to tears at the affecting recital, exhorted Christendom to unite in wresting the Holy Land from the tyranny of infidels. On this interesting occasion, the bishops, the nobles, and the people, are alike transported with a praise-worthy zeal: more than six hundred thousand combatants successively volunteer their services upon this sacred expedition; eventually effect the conquest of all Palestine, and establish a new empire in the East. The enterprise in itself was laudable; and the re-union of entire

Christendom for the attainment of a religious object and one common cause, seemed calculated to contribute much towards a cessation of mutual jealousy,—of feuds and jarring interests which armed the whole body of christians in Europe one against the other.

Literature continued to be patronised in the East. The Turks who subjugated Persia, Syria and Palestine, protected the learned, and, with their concurrence, founded some academies. Their conquests in the Indies introduced the sciences, and the philosophy of the Arabs; and familiarised the Arabian and Greek philosophers with the philosophy of the Indies. The oriental philosophers were now no longer mere translators of the ancients; they commented and criticised their works; discussed their doctrine and their principles; arranged them in proper order and connection; and, from the total result of their combination, were qualified to elicit systems of their own.

At Constantinople, hunting, dancing and voluptuousness, seemed wholly to engross the public attention: the arts and sciences were utterly despised. In the reign, however, of Constantine Monomachus—the study of letters began once more to revive: grammar and philosophy were cultivated with much care; although this philosophy consisted merely in the art of forming syllogisms and of deducing sophistical conclusions. This was an exercise of the mental faculties calculated rather to narrow than improve them.

In the West—the anathemata of the church; the dread of eternal torments; the virtues of several among the popes, bishops and other ecclesiastical superiors put a restraint upon the passions of the laity. Fewer acts of extortion, of rapine, and of plunder now took place than formerly: the churches and monasteries were more respected, discipline and order better observed: the sciences were cultivated in peace; public academies were open to all that wished to improve their understanding: the generous piety of monasteries and cathedrals supplied what was wanting to talents without fortune; and the schools were quickly crowded with an infinite number of students full of emulation and a noble ardor, which they diffused among all ranks and conditions of life. Kings, princes and noblemen;—princesses and ladies of the first quality and respectability, deemed it no disgrace to study diligently the elements of literature: learning, hitherto confined exclusively within the cloister, now burst forth with a kind of explosion which enlightened all Europe, and produced a sudden revolution in the ideas and the morals of mankind. It took off that savage predilection for arms and military ferocity,—ever the result of ignorance and barbarism; and substituted in lieu of duelling and acts of violence, exercises more congenial with humanity, and a courage inspired by the principles of right reason and religion.

During the eleventh age the method of Alcuin was adopted in the schools, under the denomination of *Trivium* and *Quadrivium*. The *Trivium* included grammar, logic and dialectics : arithmetic, geometry, astronomy and music, constituted what was termed *Quadrivium*. As at first the sciences were taught in the cathedral churches, and in the monasteries,—they were all made subservient to morality and religion. But when the number of schools was multiplied, and emulation spread more universally, philosophy became the chief object of the bulk of students, especially towards the middle of the eleventh age, when the works of Aristotle, of Avicennes and Averroes,—the introduction of Porphyrius and the categories attributed to St Augustin, were very generally studied in the West.

It is not necessary here to notice the tedious disputes of John the sophist, who maintained that logic as then taught treated only of abstract ideas, or rather of words expressing those ideas,—with his opponents who would have it, that the objects of general and abstract ideas had a real existence in nature. Suffice it to remark, that these very important wrangles between the nominalists and realists, absorbed the greater part of the attention of schoolmen for several succeeding centuries ; till Bacon caught the hint and decided the hard fought contest in favour of John the sophist.

Physics were absolutely unknown to the students of the eleventh age, if we except a part of natural history ; that, for instance, which treats of animals and of precious stones, concerning which Hildebert, bishop of Mons, and Marbonius, of Rennes, put forth publications. The mechanism of nature was not studied ; and extraordinary phenomena were deemed to prognosticate extraordinary events, or thought to be the work of a special superintending Providence. Nor was the eleventh age better versed in the art of criticism, than it was in natural philosophy ; and of course, every uncommon incident had in it something of the miraculous.

At Constantinople, while the minds of private individuals seemed wholly immersed in pleasure, the ambitious patriarch Cerularius formed the project of vindicating to himself the title of *Ecumenical* or *Universal* ; but he foresaw that the church of Rome would oppose an invincible obstacle to his wild pretensions. Therefore he renewed the groundless charges of Photius, and accused the western church of holding pernicious doctrines. He was excommunicated by the pope, and, to repay the compliment, he excommunicated the pontiff in his turn ; found means to gain the confidence of the people ; acquired much influence at the court ; raised or tranquillized the populace at will, and caused the emperor himself to tremble upon his throne. After his death, the empire continued to be disturbed with that spirit of fanaticism which he had put in motion, and which all the efforts of the

imperial authority were not equal to control. With him commenced what is usually termed the Greek schism; which to this day separates the Russian christians from the communion of the Latin church.

In the West, the candidates for the ecclesiastic state pursued the course of studies adopted in the schools, and, agreeably to that method, applied themselves particularly to the dialectic. This was thought to qualify a person to reason upon any subject of which he understood the terms; and thus, the knowledge of the fathers and ecclesiastical authors was no longer deemed essential in theology. The syllogistic art was substituted in its place; and, with the aid of this art, persons undertook to treat of the dogmata, and explain the mysteries of faith. This fallacious method taught Berengarius the novel doctrine of *Impanation* in the eucharist, and Roscelin *Tritheism* in the blessed Trinity; each pretending to elucidate more satisfactorily, according to their new rule, these most sacred and ineffable mysteries of our religion.

After the total overthrow of the Manichees, the remnants of that sect had fled into Italy, and settled among the Lombards. From Lombardy they had occasionally dispersed themselves over the several states of Europe. In their doctrinal system they had introduced some changes; and they now professed a high esteem for poverty, and affected an extraordinary love of virtue. These very specious appearances seduced some undiscerning, though apparently exemplary christians, who were in consequence arrested,—and remaining obstinately attached to their new belief, were sentenced by the magistrates to the stake. Their execution did not annihilate the sect; and its principles, disseminated with caution through the various provinces of the West, gradually fermented, and produced the most fatal effects in the succeeding centuries.

Twelfth century of the christian era.

In the East, all was anarchy and confusion. The new state which the christians had there established, was the subject of continual wars. The sultans were constantly in the field to arrest the efforts of the crusards, who poured on all sides into Syria, Palestine and Africa; and, to complete the desolation of Asia, the celebrated Prester John, with a mighty army of Tartars from the remote regions of Thibet, extended his vast empire to the borders of the Tigris. The emperor of Constantinople, unable to repel the inroads of the Saracens, and jealous alike of the successes of the crusards, tampered first with one and then the other, without being able to take advantage either of their victories, or their defeats. He was equally at variance

with Turks and Saracens;—with the Normans established in Italy, and the christians engaged in their expedition to the Holy Land. At home, the state had to struggle with the spirit of faction, and schismatical cabal. The people were overburdened with taxes by their voluptuous emperors, who for the most part indulged their extravagant humours and their luxurious propensities in the midst of the most dreadful national calamities: they were, accordingly, oftentimes deposed, and frequently murdered by their subjects.

The West, as in the preceding century, was divided into an infinite number of provinces, petty sovereignties and states. Their respective chiefs made war upon each other; and the nobles and great lords seemed unable to support the tediousness of existence out of warfare. These disorders the Roman pontiffs endeavoured to correct, or at least to turn this general passion for arms—against usurpers and unjust oppressors; as also, against the common enemies of the christian name. Consequently, it is not reasonable to attribute to ambition, or an undue system of self-aggrandisement, the efforts which they made to extend their own influence, and to contract the power of temporal princes. The celebrated Mr Leibnitz, who studied history as a philosopher and as a politician, and who, perhaps, was better acquainted than any other individual with the state of the West during these epochs of disorder, vouches,—that this overwhelming power of the popes often prevented the most serious disasters. To procure more infallibly the public good and the blessing of peace, they wished to transfer as great a share as possible, of that power and of those prerogatives enjoyed by temporal princes, and almost always by them abused—to the see of Rome. The right of investiture was a temptation to sovereigns to make a traffic of ecclesiastical benefices, bishoprics and abbeys. Gregory VII. contested this right, and would not allow it to Henry IV. Henry V. attempted to re-assume it, was excommunicated, and subsequently forsaken by the greater part of his feudatory vassals. After a furious struggle of twenty years, he was compelled to accede to the demand of canonical elections throughout all the churches of the empire;—to renounce the claim of investiture by the ring and the crosier; and was to assist at the elections, merely for the maintenance of order, by the special permission of the pope. England was involved in the same unhappy contest.

The papal power—certainly on weak and fallacious grounds—thus elevated to its zenith, became the object of ambition and cabal; its influence in the civil and political affairs of Europe made the election of a pope a concern of mighty importance to every crowned head: this laical interference in their election, made way for the introduction of antipopes; who caused pernicious schisms in the church, and excommunicated their com-

petitors, together with the sovereigns that patronised their cause. Thus religious power began to predominate in every political occurrence in the West; and from this moment it must produce, or contribute largely to produce, all important revolutions;—must, of course, be attacked or defended by temporal princes, as their respective interests should direct; gradually die away in proportion as its credit should be abused, or be entrusted in the hands of the ambitious and ill-principled, or even virtuous persons devoid of judgment and discretion; and lose entirely, for want of moderation and prudence, even what in justice was its due, and what it were to be wished for the good of christianity, it had still retained; according to the wise remark of Mr Leibnitz. (Cod. Jur. Gent. diplom.)

The state of literature, notwithstanding the unfavourable aspect of things, was gradually improving. In the midst of the horrors of war, the califs, sultans and governors in the East, were for the most part themselves men of learning; and the schools or academies established throughout the Mussulman empire were respected. Some Arabian theologists controverted alike every system of religion and philosophy; while others pretended to justify Mahometism by philosophic principles. Averroes, the most famous of their philosophers, regarded Aristotle as a being who of all others approached the highest to the divinity, and as one who had possessed a perfect knowledge of all truths.

The Constantinopolitan empire likewise had somewhat improved, from its frequent intercourse with the Saracens, and from its theological disputes with the Western church in order to justify its separation. During the course of the twelfth age it produced some philosophers, some theologians, and some few writers on jurisprudence.

The emulation which had been excited in the West during the preceding century, the patronage of princes, and the promotion, exclusively, of persons of distinguished merit to the higher dignities of the church,—combined with the introduction and astonishing propagation of the orders of Citeaux, Cluni, the Carthusians and regular *canons*, multiplied prodigiously academies and schools: which in every abbey, and almost in every monastery in the West, were opened for the purpose of diffusing literary, as well as religious improvement. The art of writing was cultivated with greater application and success in this, than in the foregoing age; nor had the eleventh century any authors comparable to St Bernard, or Peter Abelard.

The contests in which the popes were engaged with sovereigns, and sovereigns respectively with each other; also those of different religious orders with their impugnors, induced many to apply themselves to the study of the canonical and civil law, as well as of profane and ecclesiastical history. Sacred biography,

and even in some instances, universal history was handled by the writers of the twelfth age. In the philosophic academies the works of Aristotle and those of the Arabs who had commented them, particularly Averroes,—were translated into the Latin tongue; and the Aristotelian principles became so fashionable, that it was not unusual with philosophers, to refer all disputes—those of religion not excepted—to this grand criterion. In their defence of religion they affected to explain what was mysterious, by the light of reason; and to combat by philosophic arguments and the authority of the ancient sages, the novel objections of modern dialecticians. In the other sciences improvement was imperceptible. From what we have said it will be inferred,—

1. That those who wished to reconcile the dogmata of religion with the principles of philosophy, and the opinions of the ancients, moved upon the brink of precipices into which the listlessness of curiosity might easily betray them.—

2. It was natural that the new pretensions of the popes, and of the clerical orders, should give birth to numberless complaints and accusations against the sovereign pontiffs, the bishops and the clergy indiscriminately, and subject their respective rights and privileges to obloquy; and that written declamations upon the subject should be read and understood—by an infinite number of persons educated in the public schools.—

3. We must premise, that all the efforts of the twelfth century were not adequate to dispel ignorance, and re-establish order: on the contrary, one part of the clergy still remained extremely ignorant and immoral.—

4. Translations of Holy Scripture into the vulgar languages had been put forth, and thus the unexperienced and undiscerning multitude were qualified to misinterpret and abuse it.—

5. With regard to the Manichees, that excessive rigor with which they were treated in the West, had made them more cautious; but had increased their animosity, and created in the breasts of these fanatics the most infuriate desire of revenge.

Thus we may recognise in the twelfth age—many principles of error and division relative to the doctrines of religion, the jurisdiction of the church, and the reformation of manners. They produced in Abelard and in Gilbert of Porree, dogmatical errors concerning the holy mysteries of our faith; in Arnold of Brescia, the wild and frantic project of despoiling the pope and clergy of their property, and that of re-establishing at Rome the ancient republican form of government; in Waldo,—dreams of evangelical perfection, obliging christians to renounce their estates and all pretensions to any private property whatever; in Eon,—the blasphemous conceit, that he himself was Jesus Christ; in Peter of Bruys, Tankelin and the apostolics,—a variety of erroneous notions and strangely ridiculous practices, often absolutely inconsistent with each other, relating to the sa-

craments, and whatever they deemed calculated to procure esteem and veneration to the bishops and the clergy : in a word, they eventually produced the reunion of all these fanatics—in the Albigenses ;—and the crusades, undertaken in order to suppress this impious and immoral sect.

Thirteenth century of the christian era.

The East was occupied by the Moguls, the Saracens and Turks, and by the multitude of adventurers from the different nations of the West, who in the first crusade had formed a new state in Palestine and Syria. All these were incessantly at war. Gengiskan and his successors reduced by force of arms a considerable portion of the Saracen and Turkish empires ; while the princes of the West took Constantinople by storm, and established there a Latin emperor, whose successors swayed the Greek sceptre till the middle of the thirteenth century. The Greek emperors, after their restoration, were always at variance with the Turks, who finally reduced a considerable part of the Constantinopolitan territories.

In the West, Germany was convulsed by the factions of different pretenders to the empire. Otho was at length acknowledged and crowned by Innocent III. after promising by oath to protect the patrimony of St Peter. The emperor, notwithstanding, quarrelled with the Romans, and proceeded to ravage the territories of the church. Thereupon he was deposed in a council assembled by the pope. Part of the German princes elected Frederic II. in his place ; others espoused the cause of Otho, who was defeated in battle, and by his death left Frederic in quiet possession of the empire. Frederic engaged himself by vow to undertake an expedition to the Holy Land, and added to the patrimony of the Roman church ; but afterwards falling out with his holiness, he resolved to expel the bishops nominated by him in various cities of Italy, and, like his predecessor, incurred the sentence of excommunication and deposition ! Nor did the troubles and subsequent commotions in the empire cease, till the accession of Rodolph I. to the imperial throne, including a period of nearly half a century.

France and England were involved in the like disedifying contests. One part of the provinces of France was desolated by the religious wars against the Albigenses. Consequently the West was still the theatre of discord, and its attendant evils : the violence of men's passions still armed one moiety of the human race against the other. But, deplorable as were the calamities still resulting from this continual state of warfare, they are not to be compared with the horrible excesses and cruelties committed in ages anterior to the reign of Constantine, and

during the inroads of barbarians into the West, before they had embraced the doctrines of christianity; nor with those scenes of desolation exhibited in the Eastern world during this very age—by the Moguls, the Huns and Tartars, and by all those savage tribes whose passions still remained untutored by the gospel.

Science, as in the foregoing century, was protected by the Moguls in the beginning of the thirteenth; and learning greatly flourished in their empire: while, on the other hand, the conquests of the Turks insensibly annihilated it throughout the boundaries of their unhappy jurisdiction. Some few men of learning flourished among the Greeks. But almost all their efforts were employed in vain attempts to justify their schism, and to refute the writings of the Latin theologians. The crusades had rendered the Greek language more familiar in the West; and the works of Aristotle, of Plato, and other celebrated philosophers of antiquity, were now translated into Latin, and read with great avidity. The emperor Frederic II. translated a part of them himself, and caused others to be translated by various hands; while he very laudably established some schools both in Italy and Germany.

In France there reigned a sort of enthusiastic predilection for the works of the ancient sages, and particularly those of Aristotle. It was now the fashion to adopt, indiscriminately, his opinions; and such was the complaisance of certain theologians and sophists of this age for whatever originated with their admired author, that they taught, like him, the eternity of matter, and absolute fatalism. Others, not so impious, endeavoured to reconcile the opinions of this philosopher with religion; or rather, without being aware of it, they sought to reconcile religion with those fallacious principles, which they found laid down by Aristotle. Thus were many betrayed into superfluous and dangerous disquisitions, and even into a variety of errors relative to faith,—all canonically condemned and proscribed by the definitive judgment of the church. The reading of Aristotle's *Physics* and *Metaphysics* was now prohibited as a measure of precaution against error. But the prohibition itself proved rather a stimulant to curiosity; and Aristotle still had many votaries. Even some of the most celebrated divines scrupled not in their controversial writings and disputes—to avail themselves of the authority and opinions of this famous heathen author. Among these stand foremost—Albert the Great, and St Thomas of Aquino. The study of the canon law and that of theology were likewise much cultivated this century in consequence of the rising heresies of the age, and of the frequent contests which took place between the popes and crowned heads, concerning the disputed right of investiture, &c.

The southern provinces of France were full of the Manichean

sectaries called Albigenses. Against this infamous and infernal heresy a crusade was proclaimed; and thus the South of France became the theatre of a cruel war. Some cities of considerable note were reduced to ashes, and their inhabitants very inhumanly put to the sword in the course of this crusade, at the head of which was the famous Simon, count of Montfort; and a court of inquisition was established with a view to exterminate the remnants of this devoted and execrable sect. Indefatigable was the zeal of the inquisitors; and their rigor was extreme. This exposed them to the dagger of assassins; and the exercise of the inquisitorial office was for a while suspended. It was afterwards established under different regulations—in some parts of Italy;—in Spain, Portugal, and Malta: while other catholic countries very properly viewed this institution with an eye of jealousy, as productive of much evil and unchristian intolerance.

In this age were instituted the four mendicant orders of religious men, together with that of the redemption of captives, &c. The zeal of pious individuals would have founded many others, had not pope Gregory X. for prudential motives, prohibited in the council of Lateran the multiplication of religious orders. Those already instituted, particularly the mendicant, increased very rapidly, and peopled Christendom with saints. These religious families—so respectable for their piety and learning, and so useful to the community at large, especially at the commencement of their establishment,—did not live retired in deserts and in forests: they fixed their abode in the midst of cities, and there subsisted on the voluntary contributions of the pious. Here they labored for the salvation of their benefactors. Their active zeal put them upon promoting practices of devotion the best calculated to revive among the people the true spirit of religion; and they preached the doctrines of eternal life with the most astonishing success. The zeal however, of some of these religious men, appeared in certain instances, to encroach upon the rights of the clergy. The latter complained aloud against this innovation, as a violation of order, and a breach of discipline: the former alleged certain indulgences and exemptions granted in their favor by the apostolic see; and the popes patronised their claims, and silenced their opponents.

The rigors of the inquisition, and the efforts of the crusards had not extinguished the Manichean sect. Its surviving votaries had dispersed themselves in Germany, and there continued to disseminate in silence their pernicious errors—against the church, its form of worship, and its sacraments; while other sectaries declaimed immoderately against the pope and bishops, and would needs maintain that they were heretics, and that the privilege of granting indulgences, forsooth, was now transferred to *their* party.

During this age a few distinguished geniuses had marked out

for themselves a new course in the regions of science. St Bonaventure, for instance, and St Thomas,—in regard of one department of philosophy and theology; and the famous Roger Bacon, our countryman, in physics. This extraordinary character was reputed by his ignorant contemporaries—a magician, and treated as such by his religious brethren of the Franciscan order in our island!

Fourteenth century of the christian era.

From the reign of Andronicus Paleologus, the empire of Constantinople was one vast theatre of disorder. Nothing so common as to see princes promoting mutiny and rebellion, and forming unnatural conspiracies against their own parents; while the people, stupidly indifferent with regard to the evils and calamities of the state, interested themselves solely in perpetuating their pernicious schism, and sacrificed the very existence of the empire to their inveterate antipathy against the Latin church. The Turks failed not to improve these untoward circumstances to their own advantage. They established themselves in Europe; and the princes of the West were no longer able to contend with them in Palestine. Italy, France, Germany and England, were perpetually in arms. The sovereign pontiffs in many instances abused their authority, excommunicating and deposing kings; and kings in their turn, set up and abetted antipopes.

Some of the Turkish princes had patronized the sciences; but the bulk of their subjects were uncivilized barbarians, and held all literary improvement in the highest contempt. Learning, of course, quickly abandoned their inhospitable empire. The Greek emperors, observing with regret the encroachments of these savage people, who had crossed the Hellespont,—taken Adrianople, and made it the seat of their empire, began then sensibly to feel a want of the support of the Western princes, and with their utmost efforts sought to procure the reunion of the Greek and Latin churches. But the obstinacy of their bigoted subjects opposed to all their endeavours an insurmountable barrier; and caused them to apply their whole attention—to justify, if possible, their groundless and unwarrantable schism. Their cause was desperate; although, it must be owned, they made the most of it; and their writings were not altogether void of classical merit: the schools of grammar and rhetoric still subsisted at Constantinople.

Among the religious orders established in the West, some were destitute of that spirit of humility, which alone can render the most austere practices of self-renunciation either meritorious in the sight of God, or even harmless to the individuals who adopt them. In one of those orders it was warmly contest-

ed, whether the religious habit should be coarse and short, or somewhat longer and of materials not quite so rough. Some religious men as well as laics, made holiness to consist in the practice of the strictest poverty, and would not work for fear they should acquire a *right* to call any thing their own; others deemed it a point of conscience not to labour for perishable food. Some again, pretending to resemble Jesus Christ more perfectly even than St Francis, caused themselves to be wrapped in swaddling cloths, and put into a cradle. One maintained himself to be St Michael; and after his death was metamorphosed into the Holy Ghost. Another asserted, that an angel had brought a letter from above, in which Jesus Christ had declared it necessary for all that desired the forgiveness of their sins—to forsake their country, and to flog themselves severely during thirty-four days, in remembrance of the time that he had sojourned upon earth.

All these strangely stupid and ridiculous conceits had each their frantic abettors, who propagated their various sects over all the provinces of Europe. In pursuit of imaginary perfection they formed themselves into societies, the members of which were to bear towards each other a more particular affection. But soon perceiving that their fanciful perfection had not rid them of the tyranny of their passions, they were willing to compromise, and to obey them as the order of nature, while they pretended to retrench whatever went beyond this: hence, they esteemed fornication, for instance, a laudable, or at least, an innocent act in the time of temptation; whereas, these hypocrites affected to condemn all *kisses*, however innocent their motive, as enormous crimes. Of these multifarious societies of men and women—were composed the abominable sects of the Begardæ, the Fratricelli or Frerots, the Spiritual Brethren, the Apostolics, the Dulcenists, the Flagellants, the Turlupins, &c. &c.

John XXII. excommunicated the Frerots and their upholders. But these sectaries arraigned the authority by which they were proscribed, and in order to secure the patronage of princes, they coupled their errors with propositions inimical to the pretensions of the court of Rome. Much rigour was employed against them; but they survived the storm, and united with the expatriated Albigenes. This was the case among other sectarians—of the Lollards. Wickliff, an Oxford divine, made common cause with these fanatics, and in his sermons and his writings inveighed outrageously—against the pope, the clergy and the church itself,—its ceremonies, and its sacraments.

In the schools, Aristotle and his Arabian commentators were still passionately admired: many adopted their principles in judicial astrology; attributed every event to the influence of the stars, and pretended to account from the analogous disposition

of these heavenly bodies, for all human occurrences, and for the origin and the progress of every religion,—christianity not excepted. Of this number was the very fanciful Cæcus Asculanus. Others embraced the metaphysical principles of these philosophers, and undertook to reconcile them with religion: they failed in the attempt, and in general wandered wide of the truth.

Fifteenth century of the christian era.

After the defeat and captivity of the Turkish tyrant Bajazet, who was overthrown and taken prisoner in a great battle by the famous Tartarian prince Tamerlane, the empire of Constantinople enjoyed an interval of peace; while Mahomet and his brothers quarrelled about the division of the Turkish dynasty. But no sooner had the former reunited his father Bajazet's dominions in his own person, than he recommenced with vigor the war against the Greeks. The Greek empire was now on the verge of ruin. The emperor implored the aid of the Western princes; succeeded in his endeavours to reunite the Greek and Latin churches; and the decree of union procured very considerable succours to the Constantinopolitan empire. But no change was thus effected in the *discipline* of the Greek church; nor was any alteration intended in its *morality*: notwithstanding which, the clergy obstinately refused to accede to the decree, or to admit to any ecclesiastical functions—those among their brethren that had signed it. The discontent soon became general, and the greater part of those that had promoted the union, were forced to retract: the council of Florence was impeached, and the decree of union was reprobated throughout the East. The emperor was determined to support his own act and deed; while the schismatical party threatened him with excommunication, in case he should continue to hold communion with the Latin church.

Meanwhile Amurath and Mahomet II. were making daily acquisitions in the empire; and every thing prognosticated the speedy fall of Constantinople. But bigotry and fanaticism regard the destruction of empires as of trifling importance; and the Greeks on this occasion deemed it an impiety to hesitate one moment—between the ruin of their country and their groundless rancor against the Western church. Mahomet II. took advantage of their prejudices,—laid siege to Constantinople, and entered it by storm about the middle of the fifteenth century.

The German empire at this period was full of disorder and confusion: the emperors had no longer any authority in Italy; and civil contention reigned triumphant in that unhappy country. Robert the *Short*, who succeeded Wenceslas in the empire,

was not able to re-establish order; nor indeed, were those that followed him more successful in the arduous attempt.

France was not less turbulent than her neighbours. The imbecility of Charles VI,—the ambition of the dukes of Burgundy and Orleans; the murder of the last mentioned duke, which placed the crown upon the head of the king of England; the exertions of Charles VII. in order to wrest the sceptre out of his hands; the disagreement of the dauphin with his father Charles; and finally, the quarrels of Lewis XI. with the dukes of Burgundy,—of Berry, Britany, &c.; and the wars of Charles VIII. with some of these princes, together with his military expeditions into Italy, kept the nation in a continued state of irritation.

The peace of the church was disturbed by the baneful evil of schism. Gregory XII. and Benedict XIII. contested the pontificate, and were both deposed by the council of Pisa, which then proceeded to the election of John XXIII. This extraordinary measure, instead of allaying, augmented the disorder. All Europe supported respectively the different interests of one or other of these three popes. At length, however, a happy period was put to this unfortunate division by the efforts of the general council of Constance. This council saw with regret, that the church, as well as bodies politic, was obliged to tolerate in her members various abuses and disorders, which called aloud for redress; and with a view of promoting this salutary reform in discipline and order, commanded a synod to assemble at Pavia. For different reasons it was transferred to Sienna and then to Basil, whence pope Eugenius attempted to translate it to Ferrara. In this he was opposed by the prelates assembled at Basil; and, in consequence, he dissolved the council. The refractory members pretended to depose the pope, and set up Amadeus of Savoy, under the name of Felix V. Eugenius excommunicated the schismatical synod, together with the newly elected pontiff; and the two rivals continued to divide the West, till the death of Eugenius. The mildness and amiable condescension of his successor Nicolas V. restored tranquillity to the church: Felix renounced his pretensions; and the schism terminated. The succeeding popes were too much implicated in the wars of Italy, and were constantly occupied either in reuniting christian princes against the Turks, or, less laudably, with views of self aggrandizement, and the interests of their families.

The writings of Wickliff were now in extensive circulation; they had been industriously disseminated over all Europe. In them Wickliff attacked the authority of the pope, and that of the church;—their spiritual jurisdiction, as well as their temporal possessions. He inveighed with much profane scurrility against religious orders and the sacraments; and he made it a point of conscience—to refuse the payment of tithes. In a word, Wickliff's works contained principles admirably suited to

characters of all descriptions, particularly to persons whose interest inclined them to oppose—the authority of the church, the papal jurisdiction, and the influence of the clergy. In England the Begards and the Lollards had joined the Wickliffites, and had formed a considerable party, which the authority of the king, and the efforts of the clergy combined, were hardly adequate to control.

Certain theologians of this age maintained—to their full extent—the immoderate pretensions of some of the Roman pontiffs, and subjected all things to ecclesiastic power. Other sectaries and writers, in the opposite extreme, sought to despoil the church and its pastors of their just prerogatives and unalienable rights; while the more moderate and more virtuous part of christians wished to see the power of the pope and clergy reduced within its proper bounds, and the abuses and corruptions which tainted the morals of the faithful, corrected and reformed.

France, which abounded at this period with enlightened characters,—with learned divines and celebrated universities, preserved unimpaired both its civil and ecclesiastic liberty, without violating the attachment and respect due to the see of Rome; barring only some few instances of a contrary tendency—the effect of indiscreet zeal, which was censured on its first appearance, and found no advocates to canonize it. Whereas, in England, which at this time could not boast the like literary advantages with France, and where the papal influence was infinitely more absolute, the Wickliffites and Lollards were more successful: they made some proselytes, and gradually formed a party patronized by the house of commons—eventually too strong and fanatic to be intimidated by the power of the king, or annihilated by the rigours of proscription.

In Germany, John Huss undertook to establish a reform of morals. The writings of Wickliff he conceived well calculated to diminish the authority of churchmen, to whom he was inimical—from a persuasion that they would oppose his projects. In his sermons to the people he made much use of Wickliff's principles, and recommended them to his auditory—with effect. The clergy censured his doctrines, and summoned him to appear before his holiness at Rome. He was banished Prague; and from that moment was confirmed in his resolution to prosecute more vigorously his system of reform. He declaimed a-new against the church, against the clergy, against the pope, and also against the abuse of indulgences which were sometimes granted without sufficient cause; likewise against ecclesiastical censures, occasionally prostituted to unworthy purposes, and denounced alike, he said, against the innocent and the guilty. These were specious pretexts for schism and contumacy in in-

feriors, very capable of imposing upon the ignorant, and of producing in them a spirit of revolt.

Huss was ordered to attend the council of Constance, and to give an account of his seditious doctrines. He was condemned for his obstinacy, and punished by the secular power as incorrigible in his errors. His followers took up arms; and the war undertaken to reduce them, was attended in Bohemia with all its usual train of horrors. That unhappy kingdom, with a part of Germany, became one vast wilderness inundated with human blood, and covered with the ashes of once-flourishing cities—of monasteries and other sacred asylums of religion. This dreadful war terminated only with the final ruin of the whole fanatic sect.

With the exception of the Wickliffites, and their auxiliaries the Lollards, &c. those enthusiasts who had formed themselves into societies apart in the preceding age, were now no more. Only a few frantic sectaries still continued to publish their extravagant and impure theories. One Pikard, for instance, and the Adamites, renewed the infamies of the Gnostics, and were destroyed by Zisca. Certain Flemish devotees turned prophets; and some few Hussites had survived the general wreck, and retreated into forests—or lived retired in lonesome caverns.

Sixteenth century of the christian era.

The conquest of the Greek empire did not satisfy the boundless ambition of the Turkish emperors. They next attacked the provinces of the West, and established themselves in Hungary. Their warlike attitude alarmed all Europe; it influenced and regulated the enterprises of the sovereigns of the West, especially those of Germany, which the movements of the Turks seemed more immediately to affect. Against these hereditary enemies of the christian name, the sovereign pontiffs were solicitous to unite the christian powers. Their zeal, however, had not the desired effect. They wished to allot the tenth part of all ecclesiastical property to the above important concern; but this very laudable project also, was counteracted, and found impracticable.

The French had relinquished their Italian possessions ever since the reign of Charles VIII. During this interval the Venetians, the pope and the Milanese disagreeing among themselves, Lewis XII. took advantage of their quarrels, and re-entered Italy. Alexander VI. joined him; and the whole dukedom of Milan was reduced within twenty days. This excited the jealousy of the emperor Maximilian, who apprehended lest, in the event of the French becoming masters of Italy, the imperial crown should be claimed by the kings of France. Ferdinand

too, was alarmed for the kingdom of Sicily; and his views upon Naples must of course be disappointed, should the French influence prevail in Italy. Italy therefore, became the seat of war, and the object of ambition—to the kings of France, the emperors, and the Spanish monarchs, until the abdication of Charles V.

In these perplexing circumstances the bishop of Rome must act in a double capacity; as temporal prince, and as spiritual head of entire Christendom. Unhappily the obligations annexed to his character of head of the church,—obligations which have no other object than the interests of religion, the general peace of Christendom, and consequently, the good of Europe;—no other laws than those of charity, justice and truth,—sometimes, by a dereliction of duty incident to human nature, were made subservient to the politic and selfish views of the sovereign. Nor can it be denied that there have been popes, who prostituted alike their temporal and their spiritual power—to promote the interests of their family, or what is still more scandalous,—the gratification of their passions. Such were, undoubtedly,—Alexander VI. and Julius II. at the commencement of the sixteenth century. On various pretences taxes had been levied upon ecclesiastical property throughout the West; and the sovereign pontiffs had thus been enabled to draw considerable sums from almost every province throughout Europe. The clergy murmured at this abuse; and, whenever it appeared notorious that the pope converted the money thus raised—to purposes merely temporal, France and Germany were in the habit of withholding the supply.

The sovereign pontiffs moreover, enjoyed many privileges burdensome both to the people and the clergy, and which, while they filled the treasury at Rome, drained very much those countries whence they flowed; and this—at a period when commerce did not supply the deficiency. These odious and oppressive privileges operated the decline of papal power in the West, where it had numbers of determined and very formidable adversaries.

In this ill boding crisis of affairs, Leo X. formed the project of erecting a magnificent fabric in honor of St Peter. Indulgences were granted to those who should contribute towards the erection; and great abuses were committed by the collectors, as well as by some of those who were commissioned to publish from the pulpit the unseasonable grant. Luther, an Augustinian friar, in his public invectives against these disorders reprobated the indulgences themselves. Leo anathematized his doctrine, and caused his writings to be burnt. The latter appealed from the pontiff to a general council, and in his turn ordered the papal bull to be committed to the flames at Wirtemberg. This daring act of Luther much diminished in the minds of the people

that religious awe, with which the decrees of the sovereign pontiffs had hitherto impressed them, and Luther's audacity increased in proportion. He next attacked his holiness's person. Meanwhile the imperial diet was convoked, and a decree was issued by Charles V. for his arrestation, with orders that the bull of Leo X. should be put in execution. One part of Germany took up arms in Luther's defence; and several princes united to protect him. The empire was menaced by the Turks; a circumstance which prevented Charles from stifling this confederacy, and left Luther full liberty to alter at discretion—whatever in religion his testy palate and his passions did not well know how to relish. He became the apostle of seduction to a considerable part of Germany; which embraced his new religious system, and separated from the communion of the catholic church.

While this was transacting in Germany, Zuinglius, curate of Glaris, declaimed with equal violence against the indulgences published on the same occasion in Switzerland. This rival apostle makes a bold attack upon almost all the dogmata of faith; discards at once all the ceremonies of religion, and alienates from the catholic communion one half of Switzerland.

The changes thus introduced in the ancient creed and form of worship, Luther and Zuinglius denominate *reform*; and themselves they style evangelical reformers. This title produces, almost invariably, a wild fanaticism both in the head and members of any new sect. It was the case in the present instance. Each of these grand innovators found enthusiasts prepared to undertake the promulgation of their errors through the various districts of Europe,—with the hazard of their lives: these make numerous proselytes to the sect; communicate to their new converts their fanatic zeal, and disregard the perils and the torments that, in some instances, await them. Denmark, Sweden and part of Hungary are drawn over to the schism; and the English nation too, adopts a part of their novel opinions: they disturb the peace of the Low Countries, and lay the foundation of the commonwealth of the United Provinces, in Holland.

The pretended reformation of Luther and Zuinglius quickly branched forth into a vast variety of independent sects, whose tenets were as inconsistent with each other, as they were at variance with those of the catholic church. We will instance only—the Anabaptists, divided into thirteen or fourteen branches; the Sacramentarians—into nine; the Confessionists, into twenty-four;—the Extravagantes, who rejected the confession of Augsburg, into six; and we refer our readers to their respective articles.

All these different sects multiplied very rapidly in Germany, and spread their discordant doctrines—in the Low Countries,—in France, England, &c.

The superficially learned, and those who had no pretensions

to learning, were easily seduced by the sophisms of the reformers;—a humorous remark upon theologians;—a ridiculous conclusion attributed to catholics;—an ambiguous passage of scripture ill understood by any commentator of the church of Rome, or an abuse detected and reproved by some reformer,—were esteemed abundant arguments of the ignorance of catholic divines, and proved the reform to be, forsooth, one and the same thing with the re-establishment of christianity.

We have observed already that the reformed were divided among themselves: they had no regular system of divinity, no common symbol of belief. Calvin stepped forth to supply the desideratum. Calvin was a Frenchman,—a man of parts and erudition. He had embraced the reforming principles, and laid down for the foundation of his doctrine the leading maxim among protestants, that Holy Scripture is the sole rule of faith; and that each private individual is competent to judge of its true sense and meaning. Furnished with this self-interpreting principle, he pretends to deduce from scripture every dogma of the reforming system, and decks out his very erroneous theories in a clear, methodical and not inelegant style. His doctrine made rapid progress in different parts of Europe, particularly in France.

Aided by the same principle which had been so eminently serviceable to Calvin, Socinus proceeded to retrench from christianity—all the mysteries which the former had retained; and Servetus found that there existed in the universe but one individual substance!

It is then an undeniable fact, that the rule of faith admitted by all the different descriptions of the first reformers, was scripture alone interpreted by each one's private judgment. It is no less an undoubted truth, that the genuine sense of scripture must be obtained either by inspiration, or exclusively, by the aid of reason. Thus the leading principle of the reformation evidently tends—either to fanaticism,—or to a system of christianity which rejects all mysteries above the comprehension of human reason, and every form of worship the utility of which is not obvious to its natural sagacity unassisted by revelation. Time which allows a more extensive range to science, seems daily to do away, more and more perceptibly, the principles of fanaticism in protestant countries; consequently, in the different societies of the reformed, there now exists a something which, silently though forcibly—impels the protestant to Socinianism.

Such, eventually, must be the result of their favorite maxim of what they are pleased to term—*Scripture faith*; and it ought to impress all *thinking men* with the necessity of tracing back their steps to that authority, which their fathers have so unadvisedly abjured in separating from the communion of the ancient church.

While these revolutions were taking place in the religious creed

of Europe, Bacon, Gassendi and Descartes, were more happily employed in dissipating unphilosophic prejudices which hitherto had been patronised in the schools; and—in conducting mankind in their investigation of natural truths. Their method, however, of subjecting all things to the tribunal of reason, and of suspending the judgment upon points of the clearest physical evidence—combined with the principles of the reformation, had this of inconveniencé in it, that it disposed the mind to admit nothing as revealed but what reason comprehended, and to discuss, too presumptuously, the grounds of revelation itself;—to investigate in every doctrine of religion—not the luminous principles which prove its certitude, but those mysterious obscurities which prevent us from having that perfect evidence—inconsistent with the incomprehensible mysteries of our divine faith. Commerce has facilitated the means of circulating these principles through every part of Europe; and they absorb at present a great share of the attention of the literary world.

Thus is human wit, after having tried during the long lapse of eighteen hundred years every method of self-delusion in matters of faith and christian morality, reconducted by the circle of its own errors, at the close of so tedious a career—to doubt the truth of christianity itself. This religious pyrrhonism, often the effect of ignorance or levity of mind, and sometimes too, of habitual corruption, which tends to produce a certain loathing for instruction in the duties of religion, will naturally find extensive patronage in nations of a lively and inquisitive turn of mind, incapable of the attention requisite for the disquisition of serious truisms, and already prepossessed with the erroneous maxim, that nothing must be admitted as the doctrine of truth, which is not evident to human reason.

CONCLUSION.

“ If the piety of our readers is sometimes shocked at the recital of the crimes which have disfigured christianity, let them bear in mind those words of our dear Redeemer—*it is necessary that scandals come*. They are trials which ensure to his servants the recompence of their fidelity. Vice originates with the passions: these religion does not annihilate; it teaches us only, how we may subdue, while it leaves us still at liberty to indulge them. We must not, therefore, be surprised at seeing scandals in the church; where noxious weeds shall be suffered to grow indiscriminately amidst the good grain, until the time of harvest:—it is likened by our Lord himself—to a *barn-floor*, on which the *chaff* lies mingled with the *wheat*;—to a *boat*, in which there are both good and bad *fish*. These comparisons employed by Christ our Lord in the gospel, declare to us, that in the church itself there shall be found disorders and abuses;

which, indeed, it neither approves nor connives at, but laments, abhors and condemns; and endeavours with unceasing effort to repress them, although it must not look for a complete emancipation from the evil, before the final dissolution of this *earthly tabernacle*. As long as it shall continue to sojourn upon earth, scandals will not fail to arise among the faithful; an inconvenience to which the very ministers of God shall equally be liable. To the pastors of his church Jesus Christ hath promised doctrinal infallibility, not innocence of conduct: *Go, saith he, and teach all nations; baptizing them, and teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world*. In virtue of which promise Christ our Lord is present with his ministers to secure them from error in faith, but not to privilege them from vice. He hath said, He would be with them in the act of *teaching*, according to the remark of the learned Bossuet, —not to ensure their fidelity in *practising* what he had enjoined. Thus, speaking to the faithful, he bids them do what they should tell them,—not what they themselves might do. Nevertheless we are not to imagine, that their preaching will be without effect. For as the word of God is never barren, and grace is always sure to accompany sound doctrine, it will at all times continue to produce a progeny of saints. Sometimes, indeed, the harvest will appear but scanty in comparison with the greater multitude of the wicked; but, notwithstanding the variety of abuses and disorders which scandalize the church, they will never be permitted to subvert it, or even to intercept its view from the discrimination of sincere seekers. In effect, at periods the most unpromising, and in ages the least favorable to virtue and to mental acquirements, we still discover bright instances of both. The morality of the gospel hath always been in practice—with numbers of pious christians in every condition of life: each revolving age hath had its models of exemplary sanctity; pastors of irreproachable demeanour; holy virgins; truly fervent religious men; christians faithful to their duty, and persons sincerely penitent; since, in fact, it was the spirit of real compunction and unfeigned repentance, that—from the eleventh century, when barbarism and impiety were at their zenith, introduced so many new religious establishments to revive the sentiments of christianity in a disordered world; God thus inspiring extraordinary personages to enter upon so laudable a project. The church is essentially holy in her doctrine, and in her sacraments; by the worthy participation of which many of her members never fail to attain to a state of holiness; and *all* would do so, were they obedient to her precepts. If then there be found within her pale refractory and rebellious children, she will also have even in the worst of times a holy offspring and a virtuous race, so long as the preaching of the

gospel shall endure—without interruption, until the end of time. St Augustine says, we must form our judgment of the holiness of the church—not by the scandalous lives of wicked christians, but by the edifying conduct of the good, who will never be wanting to solace her under her affliction for the sins of men. It is then an error to imagine, that her eternal duration can be affected by the scandals and the crimes of wicked livers. It is God himself who has given unto her *length of days*; and neither the iniquity nor the persecutions of men shall be ever able to abridge them. Here below she is not, it is true, in the tabernacle of her repose: the earth, in *her* regard, is a place of trial, a strange and unknown land; where she is environed with enemies that seek in vain to rob her of her most valuable property, that is—of charity and truth. However violent the tempests that assail her, the faithful christian needs not fear her being overwhelmed: He who commands the swelling waves is himself the pilot of this cherished vessel. He will bring her to a secure haven. Let him whose happiness it is to have been born and nurtured in the bosom of this catholic church,—instructed in its salutary doctrines, sanctified by its sacred rites, and educated in the principles of an inviolable attachment to its faith,—rejoice at the virtues practised by its true professors, while he laments the evils which he cannot remedy, and carefully preserves *the unity of spirit in the bond of peace*; that desirable peace *which surpasseth all understanding*, and which consists in the stability of faith and the consolation of hope, and—in a union of hearts by means of perfect charity.” L’Aumont Hist. Abreg. de l’Eglise.

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE.

Primitive Patriarchs through whose medium successively, was preserved the knowledge of the true God—from the creation of the first man down to Moses. The year of their birth before Christ is marked as follows:—

Adam	-	-	4004	Lamech	-	-	3130
Cain	-	-	4003	Noe	-	-	2978
Abel	-	-	4002	Japhet	-	-	2448
Seth	-	-	3874	Sem	-	-	2446
Enos	-	-	3769	Cham	-	-	2476
Cainan	-	-	3710	<i>Deluge</i>	-	-	2348
Malaleel	-	-	3609	Arphaxad	-	-	2340
Jared	-	-	3544	Salem	-	-	2311
Enoch	-	-	3382	Heber	-	-	2281
Mathasala	-	-	3317	Phaleg	-	-	2247

Rehu - - -	2217
Sarug - - -	2185
Nachor - - -	2155
Thare - - -	2126
Abraham - - -	1995
Sarah - - -	1986
Ismael - - -	1910
Isaac - - -	1896
Jacob - - -	1836
Ruben - - -	1752
Simeon - - -	1749
Levi - - -	1748
Juda and Dan -	1747
Nephthali and Gad	1746
Isachar and Aser	1741
Zabulon - -	1740
Joseph - - -	1737
Benjamin - - -	1729
Manasse - - -	1712
Ephraim - - -	1711
Caath, son of Levi	1662
Amram, son of Caath	1630
Aaron, son of Amram	1574
Moses, son of Amram	1571

After the death of Moses,
who conducted the Hebrew people—the posterity of Abraham—out of Egypt, Josue led them into the Land of Promise in quality of

Judge - -	1451
And after him Othoniel	1405
Aod - - -	1325
Debora and Barac	1285
Gedeon - -	1245
Abimelech - -	1235
Thola - - -	1232
Jair - - -	1209
Jepthe - - -	1187
Abesan or Ibisan -	1181
Ajalon or Elon -	1174
Abdon - - -	1164
Sampson, their great champion, flourished under the administration of Heli -	1156

Samuel next governs in the capacity of Judge from the year - 1116 to - - - 1095

When Saul is proclaimed king, and is succeeded by David - 1055

Solomon - - - 1015

Roboam - - - 975

Under this king's reign, ten of the twelve tribes revolted with Jeroboam, and constituted the new kingdom of Israel.

The kings of Israel were

Jeroboam. - - -	975
Nadab - - -	954
Baasar - - -	953
Ela - - -	930
Zamri - - -	929
Amri - - -	929
Ochozias - - -	897
Joram - - -	896
Jehu - - -	884
Joachaz - - -	856
Joas - - -	851
Jeroboam II. - -	826

Interregnum during 11 years.

Zacharias - - -	773
Sellum - - -	773
Manahem - - -	771
Phacia - - -	761
Phacee - - -	759
Osee - - -	739

Salmanasar, king of Assyria, puts an end to the kingdom of Israel 721

Kings of Juda.

Roboam - - -	975
Abiam - - -	958
Asa - - -	955
Josaphat - - -	914
Joram - - -	889
Ochosias - - -	885
Athalia - - -	884
Joas - - -	878
Amasias - - -	839

Ozias - - -	810	Alexandra - -	79
Joathan - - -	758	Hyrcanus II. - -	70
Achaz - - -	742	Aristobulus the usurper	67
Ezechias - - -	726	Hyrcanus II. restored	63
Manasses - - -	698	The Jews adopt a republi-	
Amon - - -	643	can form of govern-	
Josias - - -	641	ment, and Hyrcanus	
Joachaz - - -	610	continues the office of	
Joachim - - -	610	high priest -	55
Jechonias - - -	599	Antigonus - -	37
Sedecias - - -	599	Herod the Idumean de-	
Nabuchadonosor, king of		clared king of the Jews	
Assyria, overturns the		by the Romans	41
kingdom of Judea	588	Archelaus succeeded He-	
Zorobabel reconducts the		rod his father, in the	
people into Judea	536	year of our Lord -	3
And Jerusalem is re-built		Judea becomes a Roman	
by Nehemias -	454	province - -	6
From which period the		Herod Agrippa is made	
high priests exercised		king by the Romans	37
the supreme power,		Agrippa II. - -	41
though frequently in-		Judea again reduced into	
terrupted by the suc-		a Roman province	44
cessors of Alexander the		The Jews revolt -	66
Great—to the days of		Jerusalem taken, and the	
Mathathias - - -	168	temple burnt -	70
Judas - - -	167	From which period the	
Jonathan - - -	161	Jews dispersed over all	
Simon shakes off the Sy-		the nations of the earth,	
rian yoke, and esta-		no longer form a politi-	
blishes the reign of the		cal body apart, and have	
Asmoneans - -	143	no temple.	
John Hyrcanus - -	135	Our blessed Saviour's	
Aristobulus takes the title		birth had taken place	
of king - - -	107	during the reign of	
Alexander Janneus	106	Augustus.	

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE.

SUCCESION OF POPES AND EMPERORS.

FIRST CENTURY.

<i>Popes.</i>	<i>Emperors after Julius Cæsar and Augustus.</i>
St Peter	Tiberius, Caligula,
St Linus	Claudius, Nero,
St Cletus	Galba, Otho, Vitellius,
St Clement I.	Vespasian, Titus, Domitian, and Nerva

SECOND CENTURY.

St Anacletus	Trajan
St Evaristus	Adrian
St Alexander I.	Antoninus Pius
St Xistus, or Sixtus I.	Marcus Aurelius
St Telesphorus	Lucius Verus
St Hyginus	Commodus
St Pius I.	Pertinax
St Anicetus	Didius Julianus
St Soter	Pescennius Niger
St Eleutherius	

THIRD CENTURY.

St Victor	Septimius Severus, Caracalla
St Xephirinus	Geta, Macrinus, Heliogabalus
St Callistus I.	Alexander Severus, Maximinus
St Urban I.	The two Gordians—father and son
St Pontian	Pupienus, Balbinus
St Anterus	Gordian III.
St Fabian	The two Philips—father and son
St Cornelius	Pacatianus, Decius
..... <i>Novatian.</i>	Herennius, Hostilian
St Lucius I.	Gallus, Volusian, Æmilian
St Stephen I.	Valerian I. Gallien
St Xystus, or Sixtus II.	Valerian II. Salonius, Sulpicius
St Denys	<i>The thirty Tyrants or Pretenders.</i>
St Felix	Claudius II. Quintillus, Aurelian

St Eutychianus	<i>Interregnum of eight months in 275</i>
St Caius	Tacitus, Florianus, Probus
St Marcellinus	Carus, Carinus, Numerian

FOURTH CENTURY.

t Marcellus I.	Dioclesian, Maximian
St Eusebius	Constantius Chlorus, Galerius
St Melchiades	Severus, Maxentius, Maximinus
St Sylvester I.	Constantine the Great, Licinius
St Marcus	Constantine the younger, Constans and
St Julius I.	Constantius, Julian the apostate
Liberius	Jovian, Valentinian I.
St Damasus	Valens, Gratian, Valentinian II.
. <i>Ursicinus</i> .	Theodosius the Great
St Siricius	
St Anastasius I.	

FIFTH CENTURY.

St Innocent I.	The Roman empire being divided into
St Zozimus	eastern and western, the western
St Boniface I.	was governed successively by the
St Celestin I.	following emperors—
St Sixtus III.	Honorius, Constantius, Constans
St Leo the Great	Jovinus, Constantius, Heraclian
St Hilarius	Attalus, Gratian, Valentinian III.
St Simplicius	Petronius Maximus, Avitus
St Felix II.	Majorianus, Libius Severus
St Galasius I.	Anthemius, Olybrius, Glycerius
Anastasius II.	Nepos, Augustulus

See Crevier's History of the Roman Emperors, 12 Vol. in 12.

After Augustulus the Goths reigned in Italy, and their kings under the title of kings of Italy. These were superseded by the Lombards, and the latter were subdued by Charlemagne, who restored the empire of the West in the year 800.

Emperors of the East.

Arcadius, Theodosius the younger
Marcion, Leo I. with a son of the
same name
Zeno, Basiliscus

SIXTH CENTURY.

POPE.

EMPERORS.

St Symmachus	Anastasius, Justin I. Justinian I.
..... <i>Laurentius.</i>	Justin II. Tiberius II.
St Hormisdas	
St John I.	
Felix III.	
Boniface II.	
John II.	
St Agapetus I.	
Silverius	
Vigilius	
Pelagius I.	
John III.	
Benedict I.	
Pelagius II.	
St Gregory the Great	

SEVENTH CENTURY.

Sabinian	Maurice, Phocas, Heraclius, Con-
Boniface III.	stantine II.
Boniface IV.	Heracleonas, Tiberius, Constans II.
Deusdedit	Constantine Pogonatus, Justinian II.
Boniface V.	Tiberius, Leontius
Honorius I.	
Severinus	
John IV.	
Theodore I.	
St Martin I.	
St Eugenius I.	
Vitalian	
Adeodatus	
Domnus I.	
St Agatho	
St Leo II.	
Benedict II.	
John V.	
..... <i>Peter.</i>	
..... <i>Theodore.</i>	
Conon	
St Sergius I.	
..... <i>Theodore.</i>	
..... <i>Paschal.</i>	

EIGHTH CENTURY.

POPE.

EMPEROR.

John VI.	Tiberius Absimare
John VII.	Justinian II. re-established
Lisinnius	Philippicus Bardanes, Anastasius II.
Constantine	Theodosius III. Leo the Isaurian
Gregory II.	Constantine Copronymus
Gregory III.	Leo Porphyrogenetus
Zachary	Constantine and Irene
Stephen II.	Constantine alone
Paul I.	
.....	<i>Theophilact.</i>
.....	<i>Constantine.</i>
.....	<i>Philip.</i>
Stephen III.	
.....	<i>Constantine.</i>
Adrian I.	
Leo III.	

NINTH CENTURY.

Stephen IV.	<i>Succession of the Western empire</i>
Paschal I.	<i>resumed.</i>
Eugenius II.	Charlemagne, Lewis Debonnaire
.....	<i>Zizimus</i> Lothaire, Lewis II. Charles the Bald
Valentine	Lewis the Big, Carloman
Gregory IV.	Charles the Fat, Arnoul
Sergius II.	<i>Empire of the East.</i>
Leo IV.	Irene is superseded by—
Benedict III.	Nicephorus; to him succeed—
.....	<i>Anastasius</i> Stauration, Michael Curopalates
Nicholas I.	Leo the Armenian
Adrian II.	Constantine, son to the latter
John VIII.	Michael the Big
Marinus	Theophilus, Michael III.
Adrian III.	Basil the Macedonian
Stephen V.	Constantine, son to Basil
.....	<i>Anastasius</i>
Formosus	
.....	<i>Sergius</i>
Boniface VI.	
Stephen VI.	
Romanus	
Theodore II.	

TENTH CENTURY.

POPES.

EMPERORS.

John IX.	<i>Western, or rather, German emperors.</i>
Benedict IV.	Lewis III. Conrad I. Henry the Fowler
Leo V.	Otho the Great, Otho II.
..... Christopher	<i>Eastern, or Constantinopolitan emperors.</i>
Sergius III.	Leo the Philosopher, Alexander
Anastasius III.	Constantine VII. with Romanus
Lando	Christopher and Stephen—
John X.	All of them emperors in the year 915
Leo VI.	Constantine by himself from 948 to 959
Stephen VII.	Romanus II. Nicephorus, Phocas
John XI	John Zimisces, Basil
Leo VII.	
Stephen VIII.	
Marinus II.	
Agapetus II.	
John XII.	
Leo VIII.	
Benedict V.	
John XIII.	
Benedict VI.	
Boniface VII.	
Domnus II.	
Benedict VII.	
John XIV.	
John XV.	
John XVI.	
Gregory V.	

ELEVENTH CENTURY.

Sylvester II.	<i>Emperors of Germany.</i>
John XVII.	Otho III. Henry II.
John XVIII.	Conrad II. Henry III.
Sergius IV.	<i>Of Constantinople.</i>
Benedict VIII.	Basil, Constantine
..... Leo or Gregory	Romanus Argyrius
John XIX.	Michael IV. Michael Calaphates
Benedict IX. abd.	Constantine Monomachus
..... Sylvester and John	Theodora, Michael VI.
Gregory VI.	Isaac Comnenus
Clement II.	Constantine Ducas
Damasus II.	Michael Andronicus
Leo IX.	Romanus Diogenes
Victor II.	Michael Ducas

POPEs.

EMPERORS.

Stephen IX.	Constantine Ducas
..... <i>Benedict X.</i>	Nicephorus Botoniates
Nicholas II.	
Alexander II.	
..... <i>Honorius II.</i>	
Gregory VII.	
..... <i>Clement III.</i>	
Victor III.	
Urban II.	

TWELFTH CENTURY.

Paschal II.	<i>German Emperors.</i>
..... <i>Albert, Theodoric.</i>	Henry IV. Henry V.
Gelasius II.	Lothaire II. Conrad III.
..... <i>Maurice Bourdin.</i>	Frederick I. Henry VI.
Calixtus II.	<i>Constantinopolitan.</i>
Honorius II.	Alexis Comnenus
Calixtus III.	John Comnenus
Innocent II.	Manuel Comnenus
..... <i>Anacletus, Victor.</i>	Alexis Comnenus
Celestin II.	Andronicus Comnenus
Lucius II.	Isaac Angelus
Eugenius III.	
Anastasius IV.	
Adrian IV.	
Alexander III.	
... <i>Victor, Paschal, Calixtus, Innocent</i>	
Lucius III.	
Urban III.	
Gregory VIII.	
Clement III.	
Celestin III.	

THIRTEENTH CENTURY.

Innocent III.	<i>German Emperors.</i>
Honorius III.	Philip, Otho IV.
Gregory IX.	Frederick II. Conrad IV.
Celestin IV.	William
Innocent IV.	Interregnum of some years
Alexander IV.	Rodolphus of Harpsbourg
Urban IV.	Adolphus of Nassau
Clement IV.	<i>Constantinopolitan Emperors.</i>
Gregory X.	Alexis Angelus
Innocent V.	Alexis Murzuphlus

POPES.

Adrian V.
John XXI.
Nicholas III.
Martin IV.
Honorius IV.
Nicholas IV.
St Celestin V.
Boniface VIII.

EMPERORS.

And after the taking of Constantinople by the Latins—Baldwin I.
Henry, Peter,
Robert and Baldwin II.
At Constantinople.
Theodore Lascaris
John Ducas
Theodore Lascaris restored, and
John Lascaris—at Nice
Michael Paleologus retakes Constantinople—and is succeeded by—
Andronicus Paleologus

FOURTEENTH CENTURY.

Benedict XI.	<i>German Emperors.</i>
Clement V. at Avignon	Albert, Henry VII.
John XXII.	Frederic III. Lewis IV.
..... <i>Peter</i>	Charles IV. Wenceslas
Benedict XII.	<i>Constantinopolitan.</i>
Clement VI.	Michael Andronicus
Innocent VI.	Andronicus II.
Urban V.	John Paleologus
Gregory XI. returns to Rome.	
Urban VI.	
... <i>Clement VII. Benedict XIII.</i>	
Boniface IX.	

FIFTEENTH CENTURY.

Innocent VII.	<i>German Emperors.</i>
Gregory XII.	Robert Sigismund
Alexander V.	Albert II. Frederic IV.
John XXIII.	<i>Constantinopolitan.</i>
Martin V.	Manuel (II.) Paleologus
Eugenius IV.	John VII. Paleologus son of Manuel
<i>Clement VII. at Avignon</i>	Constantine Paleologus—till 1453,
<i>Benedict XIII. Clement VIII.</i>	when the Turks entered Constantinople by storm, and thus was terminated the Roman dynasty in the East
Felix V.	See the History of the Lower Empire by M. Le Beau, 18 vol. in 12.
Nicholas V.	Echard's Roman History, &c.
Calixtus III.	
Pius II.	
Paul II.	
Sixtus IV.	
Innocent VIII.	

SIXTEENTH CENTURY.

POPEs.

Alexander VI.
 Pius III.
 Julius II.
 Leo X.
 Adrian VI.
 Clement VII.
 Paul III.
 Julius III.
 Marcellus II.
 Paul IV.
 Pius IV.
 Pius V.
 Gregory XIII.
 Sixtus V.
 Urban VII.
 Gregory XIV.
 Innocent IX.

EMPERORS.

Emperors of Germany.
 Maximilian I. Charles V.
 Ferdinand I. Maximilian II.

SEVENTEENTH CENTURY.

Clement VIII.
 Leo XI.
 Paul V.
 Gregory XV.
 Urban VIII.
 Innocent X.
 Alexander VII.
 Clement IX.
 Clement X.
 Innocent XI.
 Alexander VIII.
 Innocent XII.

Rodolph II. Mathias
 Ferdinand II. Ferdinand III.

EIGHTEENTH CENTURY.

Clement XI.
 Innocent XIII.
 Benedict XIII.
 Clement XII.
 Benedict XIV.
 Clement XIII.
 Clement XIV.
 Pius VI.

Leopold I. Joseph I.
 Charles VI. Charles VII.
 Francis I. Joseph II.
 Leopold II. Francis II. the now reign-
 ing emperor.

NINETEENTH CENTURY.

Pius VII.
 See the Ecclesiastical
 History of Fleury. Dic.
 de L'Avocat, &c.

ABECEDARIANS,—a sect of Anabaptists who pretended that, in order to salvation, a person must be unqualified either to read or write, and must be ignorant of the letters of the alphabet; from which circumstance their name originates.

When Luther had openly attacked the authority of the church, and of tradition; and had established the principle, that each private individual was competent to determine the sense of scripture for himself, his disciple Stork advanced a step farther, and maintained that each individual among the faithful was *equally* qualified to penetrate the sense of the inspired writings, as the best divines; that God himself was our immediate instructor, and that study took off our attention to the divine inspirations. Hence he inferred, that the only method to prevent distractions would be, absolutely not to learn to read.—This sect was some time considerable in Germany. (*Stockman, Lexic. in voce Abecedarii. Osiander, Centur. 16, l. 2.*)

In every age ignorance has had its patrons, who affected to esteem it a christian virtue; such were formerly the Gnosimachi, the Cornificians, &c. This absurdly ridiculous idea is at formal variance with Holy Scripture; for, *learning and wisdom*, saith the wise man, *excel in this, that they give life to him that possesseth them.* (Eccles. vii. 13.)

ABELARD or **ABAEALARD** was a native of France, and flourished towards the close of the eleventh, and good part of the succeeding century. His misconduct, his literary contests, and his dogmatical errors, have concurred to make him a celebrated character. He taught logic and theology with great reputation, and soon became the oracle of the schools. But having had the misfortune to implicate himself in an amorous intrigue, his subsequent miscarriages determined him to seek refuge in religion. In his retreat he did not long remain inactive; and he undertook to explain the mysteries and the truths of christianity by sensible comparisons, and to combat by the authority of the philosophers and philosophic principles, the difficulties objected against religion by the sophistry of dialecticians. This is the object which he proposes to himself in his *Introduction to Theology*, and in his book of *Christian Theology*.

These are the two most famous works which issued from the pen of Abelard. True philosophy, according to this writer, patronises religion, and seeks to penetrate its spirit; but if it does not succeed in dissipating the obscurity which envelopes its mysteries, it concludes that it lies beyond its sphere to see and comprehend all things, and infers the absurdity of rejecting any doctrinal point merely because it cannot be conceived by human reason. Divine revelation, he asserts, should alone suffice to bring conviction to the understanding. After explaining the

dogma of the blessed Trinity which he attempts to illustrate by imperfect comparisons—for all such are essentially imperfect and totally inadequate to give a clear idea of this sublime mystery—Abelard proceeds to treat of the Divine Power, and to examine—whether God could have done any thing which in fact he hath not done. He seems well aware of the difficulty of the question; and to resolve it, he lays down as an invariable maxim, that the wisdom and goodness of the supreme Being are the springs which call his power into action: and from this principle he concludes, that whatever God has at any time produced, has been prescribed by his wisdom and goodness; and if there be any good which he has left undone, the reason was,—it could not have been done, according to Abelard, consistently with his wisdom; and, by consequence,—what he has done, he could not have left undone, nor do any thing which he has not done. This doctrine, in its obvious sense, would appear to bear hard upon the liberty of the Divine Being, and is consequently erroneous.

Abelard's theological tracts were received with applause; and they certainly contained some very excellent matter: but on the other hand, they contained also expressions somewhat novel, extraordinary opinions, and comparisons very liable to be abused—with real doctrinal errors. Abelard in consequence, was cited before a council assembled at Soissons by the archbishop of Rheims. His errors were condemned; and he on that occasion recited upon his knees the creed which bears the name of Athanasius, and protested he had no other faith than that which it contains: after which he was confined in the monastery of St Medard at Soissons. A short time afterwards he was enlarged, and recommenced his theological exercises.

Twenty years after this transaction, a council was held at Sens, in which several erroneous propositions contained in the writings of Abelard were condemned, and afterwards anathematized by the pope, to whom Abelard had signified it his intention to appeal. In the list of the proscribed errors were the following:—

Although the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son, he is not of the same substance.

We can desire and do good by the efficacy of our free will, without the aid of Grace.

We derive from Adam—not the guilt, but only the penalty of original sin.

God *can* do nothing but what he *has* done, or *will* do hereafter.

Jesus Christ did not descend into hell.

These with other erroneous propositions, and all the errors with which he was charged, Abelard retracted and condemned. He was reconciled to St Bernard before he died, and made an edifying end in a house dependent on the monastery of Cluni.

ABELONIANS,—sectaries of the diocese of Hippo, who professed an extraordinary veneration for Abel. They pretended that every one ought to marry like Abel, but not to use the privilege of matrimony. Thus husbands and wives lived together in a state of continence, and adopted a little boy and girl to succeed to their effects. (See St August. Hær. 86.)

ABSTAINERS,—a name given in common to the sectaries of Tatian, and to the Manichees; because they abstained through a superstitious motive from wine, matrimony, &c. See the articles **TATIANS** and **MANICHEES**.

ABYSSINIANS or **Ethiopians**,—an African nation of the sect termed Jacobites. The church of Abyssinia acknowledges that of Alexandria for its mother church, without whose concurrence it does not elect even its own bishop. This custom, which is as ancient as the conversion of Abyssinia before 325—when the council of Nice places the bishop of Ethiopia the seventh in rank, and next to the bishop of Seleucia, is authorised in a certain collection of canons, for which the Abyssinians testify an equal degree of religious deference as for the sacred writings themselves. Consequently, the faith professed in Abyssinia was the same with that of the church of Alexandria; and the Ethiopians did not become Monophusites or Eutychians till after Egypt fell into the hands of the Saracens, and the Jacobites had intruded themselves into the patriarchate of Alexandria.

The errors of the Cophts and those of the Abyssinians are the same. They believe in common what the church of Rome believes relating to the mysteries of religion; but they do not receive the council of Chalcedon. They reject the letter of St Leo; acknowledging only one nature in Jesus Christ, although they very inconsistently maintain, that the Divine and human natures are not confounded in the person of our blessed Redeemer. (See Perpet. de la Foi, t. 4, l. 1, c. 11, Mendes. l. 1, c. 6, Ludolf, Hist. Æth. l. 3, c. 8, Voyage de Lobo par Le Grand.)

They hold seven sacraments with the catholics, although Ludolf erroneously asserts, that they have neither confirmation nor extreme unction. In the same manner Ludolf, deceived by the silly answers of an ignorant Abyssinian when interrogated by him upon the subject, misguides his readers in stating, that the church of Abyssinia does not believe the real presence and transubstantiation. Their liturgies quoted by Ludolf himself, formally assert the contrary. (Hist. Æth. l. 3, c. 5.) This author acknowledges that the Abyssinians invoke the saints, and render to them a religious veneration; that they pray for the dead, and honor sacred relics, as the Cophts also do; but he is willing to attribute all this to the zealous though indiscreet sermons of their bishops: whereas it is a well known fact, that they have no

other bishop in Ethiopia, but the Abuna or metropolitan; nor is it customary in that country to preach at all. Mr Ludolf is equally unfortunate in hazarding other similar conjectures.

This people however, like the Cophts, observe the ceremony of circumcision, and some other Jewish practices; such, for instance, as abstaining from blood and from the flesh of things strangled; although it is far more natural to conclude, that they have received these practices from the Cophts, than with Mr Croze to contend, that they have derived them immediately from the Mahometans or the Jews. (*Christianisme d'Ethiopie.*)

Among the Cophts indeed, some regard their use of circumcision as a compliment which they were forced to make to the Mahometans; others as a practice merely civil. The Abyssinians are equally divided upon the origin and the nature of circumcision; some esteeming it a religious ceremony essentially necessary to salvation. Father Lobo was entertained with the following humorous anecdote by an Abyssinian monk. One of his sable majesty's plenipotentiaries had infested a certain fountain, and tormented in an extraordinary manner the poor monks that resorted thither for water. Him Thecla Aimanac founder of their institute had converted, and experienced no serious difficulty in the undertaking, if we except the controverted point of circumcision. The black one absolutely refused to be circumcised, till Thecla had convinced him of its necessity by dint of argument; and he performed himself the operation. This quondam devil taking afterwards the religious habit, died within ten years after his conversion, in the odor of sanctity. (*Relation Hist. de l'Abyssinie, Le Grand, p. 202.*)

Abulselah, an Egyptian author who flourished about four hundred years ago, says that the Ethiopians, instead of confessing their sins to the priests, confessed them once in the year before an altar upon which some incense lay evaporating, and that they fancied they thus obtained the Divine pardon: Michael, metropolitan of Damietta, endeavours to justify this practice in his treatise against the necessity of confession: nor would it appear extraordinary, that the practice should have passed out of Egypt into Ethiopia under the patriarchs John and Maria, who patronised this abuse. Zunzebo however, assures us, that in his country auricular confession was in use; and the discipline of the church of Alexandria prescribed it. The genuine tradition of any church must be collected from its ecclesiastical canons, and not from abuses which may have superseded discipline. (*See Perpetuité de la Foi.*)

In fact, the Abyssinians do confess their sins to the priests, and sometimes to the metropolitan, who when they accuse themselves of any grievous crime, starts from his seat, severely reprimands the sinner, and calls for his lictors. These without any ceremony fall to and flog the penitent with all their might, till the people who happen to be in the church at the time, hasten

to intercede for the culprit ; when the Abuna proceeds to absolve him. (Ludolf, Hist. Eth. l. 2, c. 6.)

Some of the Abyssinian churchmen, as is generally the practice all over the East, live in the married state. But neither priests nor deacons are allowed to marry after their ordination ; and the marriage of any monk or nun is deemed sacrilegious. With them a plurality of wives is not uncommon. This abuse the patriarchs of Alexandria have in vain attempted to suppress. Of all nations in the world Abyssinia abounds most in churches and monasteries. The sacred psalmody may be distinctly heard from one church to another, and often in many at the same instant. Each monastery has two ; one for men, the other for women. The men sing in chorus, and always standing. Their musical instruments consist chiefly of small drums which they have suspended from their neck, and which they beat with both hands. These instruments even the most dignified of their clergy use. They commence their music by striking the ground with their feet : then, as their devotion gradually increases, they throw aside their instruments ; begin to clap with their hands, to jump and dance and raise their voice to its utmost pitch. At last, they observe neither time nor pause in their psalmody ; and say with Mr Evans's jumping Methodists (see Jumpers) that David taught them thus to celebrate the praises of God, in his psalms where he says : ALL YE NATIONS CLAP WITH THE HANDS, REJOICE BEFORE GOD, &c. (Lobo, Relation Historique de l'Abysinie.)

The church of Abyssinia is governed by a metropolitan, whom they style *Abuna*, that is, our Father. He is elected and consecrated by the patriarch of Alexandria, who never makes any native of Abyssinia metropolitan, that thus he may more infallibly secure its dependence upon the church of Alexandria ; nor does he suffer any other bishop to be ordained in that country but the Abuna alone.

In the seventeenth century the re-union of the church of Abyssinia with that of Rome, was prosecuted for some time with considerable success ; but failed eventually through the extreme indiscretion and too forward zeal of those commissioned to effect it. This drew upon the catholics of Abyssinia a cruel persecution ; and from that period the sole religion professed throughout the kingdom is the Copht, that is Eutychianism. (See Lobo, Relat. de l'Abyss. Ludolf, Hist. Æthiop. Telles, t. 2. Thevenot. La Croze, Christianisme d'Ethiopie. The last mentioned writer has fallen into similar mistakes with those of Ludolf.)

ADALBERT, or Adelbert, was born in France at the commencement of the eighth century. From his youth he was a notorious hypocrite and impostor. He pretended that an angel in a human form had brought him, from the extremities of the

globe, certain relics of extraordinary holiness, by means of which he could obtain of God whatever he requested. Thus he deluded the ignorant people, and drew after him a train of female devotees, and a multitude of peasants, who in this age of ignorance and superstition revered him as a man of apostolical sanctity, and a worker of many miracles. By dint of bribery he prevailed upon some simoniacal bishops to confer upon him the episcopal dignity.

From this period, his pride and vanity knew no bounds. He did not hesitate to compare himself with the apostles and the martyrs, and refused to consecrate any church in their name; but chose rather to erect and dedicate oratories under his own invocation. He distributed the parings of his nails, and his hair, to the silly populace, who rendered to them the same respect as to the relics of St Peter. When persons presented themselves at his feet to confess their sins, he would exclaim,—“ I know your sins already; your most secret thoughts are revealed to me: your sins are forgiven you; depart in peace,—with a steady conviction that you have been effectually absolved.” The deluded penitent then arose, in perfect security that his sins were pardoned. (St Boniface, Ep. 135.)

Adalbert had composed a history of his own life—full of visions, false miracles and fables. He says he was born of poor and illiterate parents, but that God had crowned him even from his mother’s womb. In her pregnancy she had dreamed that a calf had issued from her side. This, Adalbert would have it, signified the grace which he had received by the ministry of St Michael. Adalbert also forged a letter which he ascribed to Jesus Christ, and which, he pretended, came from heaven through the ministry of the same St Michael. It runs thus:—“ In the name of God, here begins the letter of our Lord Jesus Christ, which fell at Jerusalem, and which was found by St Michael the archangel at the gate of Ephrem, read and copied by the hand of a priest called John, who sent it to the city of Jeremy to another priest named Talasius; and Talasius sent it into Arabia to another priest called Leoban. Leoban sent it to the city of Bethsamy, where it was received by the priest Macarius, who sent it to the mountain of St Michael the archangel; and the letter arrived, through the medium of an angel, at the sepulchre of St Peter at Rome, where are the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and the twelve priests who are at Rome observed vigils of three days with prayer and fasting day and night.” This ridiculous and apparently unmeaning forgery was, however, well qualified to catch the attention of the admiring and unsuspecting multitude. The impostor seemed aware of this. He composed the following prayer for the use of his sectaries: “ Lord God all powerful, Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, *Alpha and Omega*, who sitteth upon the throne

above, upon the Cherubim and Seraphim ; I beseech and conjure thee Angel Uriel, Angel Raguel, Angel Tabuel, Angel Michael, Angel Inias, Angel Tabuas, Angel Sabaoth, Angel Simiel," &c. &c. (See Conc. t. 6, p. 1553.)

St Boniface, who labored with a zeal truly apostolical for the destruction of error, procured the condemnation of Adalbert in a council assembled at Soissons. But Adalbert, far from submitting to the censure, grew daily more extravagant. St Boniface had recourse to the pope, who called a council in which Adalbert was again condemned. We hear no more of this fanatic and his absurdities from that time, excepting only, that St Boniface, by order of the Princes Carloman and Pepin, caused him to be confined.

The irruptions of barbarians into the Roman empire had put an end to studies. Religion alone had endeavoured to revive them ; though even churchmen partook in the general disorder. The contempt in which the barbarians held the arts and sciences, and the necessity under which ecclesiastics often lay of subsisting by the labour of their hands, had made them very ignorant ; and the new converted infidels still retained a part of their ancient superstitions. The rules of criticism were totally unknown ; and miraculous accounts were in high estimation, and seemed almost exclusively to engross the public attention. Adalbert remarked it, and improved this general disposition to his own vile purposes of hypocrisy and seduction. (See Fleury's disc. 3, sur L'Histoire Eccles. and tome 4, de l'Hist. Litteraire de France.)

ADAMITES were sectaries who, the more perfectly to imitate Adam and Eve in the state of innocence, stripped themselves, and appeared stark naked in their public assemblies. This sect used no form of prayer, and looked upon all human actions as in themselves perfectly indifferent. They professed the most violent enmity against the Creator of this visible world, because, said they, he had degraded the native dignity of the human soul, and had confined it to a material body. Hence they esteemed it a sacred duty to transgress the laws imposed upon man by his Creator ; and this strange and impious principle, joined with the idea that all human actions are in themselves indifferent, must naturally tend to produce the most horrid licentiousness. Accordingly, we find that some Adamites indulged in every species of infamy and debauch ; alleging religion as the motive of their conduct.

Various sorts of Adamites have made their appearance in different ages : in the fourteenth century they were denominated Turlupins and *the poor Brethren*. A fanatic named Picard renewed the sect among the Anabaptists. See the article *Anabaptist*.

ADOPTIONISTS—the followers of Felix, bishop of Urgel in Catalonia. Felix in a letter to Elipandas, archbishop of Toledo, who had consulted him on the subject, about the year 778 pretended to prove, that Christ as man is not the natural, but only the adoptive son of God; a doctrine which he had already advanced in his public discourses. The rising error was condemned by a council at Narbonne in 788, and by another at Ratisbon in 792, while the emperor Charlemagne kept his court in that city; and previously to both, by pope Adrian in a doctrinal letter addressed to all the bishops in Spain. Felix revoked his error, first in the synod at Ratisbon, and afterwards before pope Leo III. at Rome. Yet after his return into Spain he ceased not both by letters and discourse to spread his innovating principles. He was accordingly condemned again in the great council of Francfort in 794. Alcuin on his return from England whence he had been absent three years, in 793 had written to Felix a tender letter, exhorting him sincerely to renounce his error. But the unhappy man in a long answer, endeavoured to establish his heresy with so little reserve, as to fall into downright Nestorianism. This, in effect, is the natural consequence of his erroneous opinion. For Christ as man cannot be called the adoptive Son of God, unless his human nature subsist by a distinct person from the divine. (See Nat. Alex. Sæc. 8, diss. 5.)

By an order of Charlemagne, Alcuin our countrymen, and St Paulinus, patriarch of Aquileia, solidly refuted the writings of Felix and Elipandus,—the former in seven, the latter in four books. Alcuin added other four books against the pestilential writings of Elipandus, in which he testifies that Felix was then at Rome, and converted to the catholic faith. Elipandus not being a subject of the French empire, could not be compelled to appear before the councils held in the dominions of Charlemagne; Toledo making then a part of the Moorish conquests. Felix after his relapse returned to the faith together with his principal followers, during the sessions of the council at Aix in 797. From that time, however, he maintained his former opinions in secret, and at his death in 815 left a written profession of his heresy.

AERIUS—a proud and ambitious monk, who had formerly professed the opinions of Arianism. His friend Eustathius was made Bishop of Constantinople;—a crime which the envious Aërius could never pardon him. Eustathius endeavoured by the most conciliating demeanour to sooth his furious jealousy; promoted him to the priesthood, and gave him the superintendency over his hospital. All this condescension on the part of Eustathius served only to inflame his passion; and he never ceased arraigning the conduct of his superior. The good prelate mildly remonstrated; but without effect. Aërius proceeded to deny the authority of his superior, and ranked the priest-

hood on a level with the episcopal dignity. He then wantonly declaimed against whatever tended to enhance the credit of Eustathius, or to conciliate to him the veneration of the people. He reprobated all the ceremonies of the church, and the celebration of festivals, in which the bishop bore a distinguished part: the catholic practice of praying for the dead he equally disapproved; and he denied that the church had power to institute fasts.

Having thus digested his new system of reform, Aërius quitted his hospital, began to dogmatise in public, and seduced a multitude of ignorant people of both sexes who abandoned the church to follow him, and constituted the sect from him denominated Aërians. This sect was still in being in St Augustine's time; and their religious errors have been renewed by our modern reformers. It may not be improper to examine—upon what grounds.

The church is a visible society which has its form of worship, its ceremonies, and its laws: consequently, it must have its superiors, and an order of men whose office it is to preach, to instruct, to legislate, and see their ordinances duly executed. This order of men Jesus Christ himself established in his church; he commissioned the apostles to teach his doctrine; he conferred on them the power to forgive sins. (John 20, v. 22, 23.) Throughout the New Testament, they are represented as the ministers of God, separated apart from the rest of the faithful, and established by the Holy Spirit for the government of the church. (1 Cor. c. 4. 2 Cor. c. 3. Act. c. 20.) There exist then in the church ministers who possess by divine right—a real superiority over the rest of the faithful. Nor are they all of equal dignity. The hierarchy is composed of bishops, priests and deacons. The bishops are the lawful successors of the apostles; and the apostles were of an order superior to that of the priesthood. We see in the Acts of the Apostles, that St Paul and Barnabas established priests in the cities, who did not belong to the college of the apostles: every where the latter are mentioned as a distinct order of bishops. (Acts xiv. xv.) At *their* tribunal exclusively, priests are summoned to appear. Consequently, bishops either by their institution, or by their ordination, and of course by divine right, possess a superiority of order and jurisdiction not enjoyed by the priesthood. This distinction may be traced through every age, and it necessarily supposes in the bishop a superiority of divine right: it is expressly noticed in the letters of St Ignatius;—by Origen, and Tertullian. (Ignat. Ep. ad Magnes. ad Ephes. Orig. hom. in Luc. 20. Tert. Coron. Milit.) Bishops alone had the exclusive right of ordaining bishops, priests and deacons; and the ordinations conferred by simple priests have always been esteemed invalid. In this the Greeks and Cophts, and Nestorians unanimously agree with the

catholic church. The contrary opinion is subversive of the sacred hierarchy, adverse to Holy Scripture, inimical to tradition and to the immemorial practice of the faithful. Hamond and Pearson have discussed this point very satisfactorily against the presbyterians; and Mons. Nicole has refuted the minister Claude upon the same subject beyond the possibility of a reply. (Ham. dissert. cont. Blondel. Pearsonii opera posth. Pretendus Re-formés convaincus de schisme, l. 3, c. 19. See also Petavius, dogmes Theolog.)

This superiority of the episcopal order over the priesthood, does not give to bishops an unlimited authority. They are not infallible; and hence their jurisdiction has its bounds. Thus a bishop has no right, for instance, to command his priests to teach Arianism, which was condemned by the council of Nice; or to alter the discipline ordered by that council to be observed by the universal church. Consequently, in the church there resides an authority superior to that of a bishop, binding him to respect its laws which he cannot oblige any of his clergy to set aside; but he has power to enforce the observance of those laws, and to punish the refractory. As, however, the bishop may be deceived in the application and interpretation of the laws of the church,—to prevent or redress the mischievous consequences which might occasionally result, there lies an appeal from his decisions to a higher ecclesiastical tribunal. The church is a society purely religious, whose laws have nothing to do with interests of a nature merely politic or temporary; whence it follows that, as the alliance of church and state cannot affect the essence and constitution of the church, the ecclesiastic and civil powers remain perfectly distinct, and are not at variance with each other.

Aërius's objections to the catholic practice of *praying for the dead* are in formal opposition to what we read in the second book of Machabees (c. xii. v. 46.) *It is a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead, that they may be loosed from their sins.* Protestants indeed, have endeavoured to evade the force of this scriptural text, by denying the second book of Machabees to be canonical. Their exceptions are without foundation; since the second book of Machabees was numbered among the canonical books of scripture—by almost all the christian churches,—in the decree of Innocent I. and in the fourth council of Carthage. The doubts of some few fathers and particular churches, are of little weight against the unanimous consent of all the rest. Moreover, Jesus Christ in the gospel declares, that there are certain sins which shall not be remitted either in this world or in the world to come. From which words the fathers very rationally conclude, that there are some sins to be forgiven in the next world, and that it is the duty of christians to pray for their deceased brethren. In fact, praying for the dead has ever been

in constant practice in the church. It was already the custom in the second age; and Tertullian ranks it among the apostolical traditions. Nor was it intended solely for the comfort of surviving friends, or to return thanks to Almighty God for the favours which he had conferred upon the deceased; it was also to obtain for them a mitigation of their sufferings. (Joan 6, v. 27. Tert. de Monogam. c. 10. Aug. de cura pro mortuis. Chrysost. Hom. in Ep. ad Philip. circa fin.) Praying for the dead most certainly is a practice very congenial with christian charity. Our love for Jesus Christ ought to unite us with his *body*, and make us feel an interest in the welfare or misfortune of his members. As then it is incumbent on the lovers of God, to rejoice at the happiness and the triumphs of his saints, just so ought we to compassionate the sufferings of his servants who have still the debt of punishment to pay to Divine justice. This we cannot better do, than by pouring forth in their behalf our pious supplications. All our controvertists have handled this subject in a manner highly satisfactory. (See also vol. xi. of Butler's Lives of Saints—All-Souls-Day.)

The other erroneous doctrines of Aërius we shall briefly discuss under the various articles LUTHER, ANABAPTISTS, QUAKERS, WICKLIFFITES, &c.

AETIUS—head of the Anomians or Eunomians. See EUNOMIANS.

AGAPETÆ—a sect of Gnostics who made their appearance towards the close of the fourth century. St Jerome says, that this sect was composed principally of abandoned female enthusiasts, who endeavoured to seduce young men, and taught them that—to pure consciences nothing was impure. Another maxim of this execrable sect was—to swear and forswear themselves rather than reveal the secret of their abominable system. (St August. Her. 70. Stockman, Lexic.)

AGARENIANS—a sort of christians who about the middle of the seventh century, exchanged the gospel for the alcoran. They denied the Trinity, and pretended that God had no son; because, forsooth, he had no wife. These apostates were called Agarenians, from their embracing Mahometism, the religion of the Arabians, who were descended from Ismael, the son of Agar. (Stockman, Lexic.)

AGIONITES—a sect of debauchees who condemned alike both matrimony and chastity, which they affected to look upon as the inventions of the evil principle. These wretches abandoned themselves to every species of vice. They appeared about the end of the seventh century, in the reign of Justinian

II. They were anathematized by the council of Langres. (Stockman, Lexic.)

AGNOETES or *Ignorant*,—a denomination given—1. to the sectaries of Theophronius, who towards the close of the fourth age pretended, that the Deity did not know all things; and that he gradually acquired an increase of knowledge. This is an absurdity. It is most evident that a Being necessarily existing must, of course, be endowed with omniscience. The Socinians of modern date have renewed this error of Theophronius. See the article SOCINIANS. 2. Those too, are termed Agnoètes, who maintained that Jesus Christ had but a limited knowledge, and that he was ignorant of the time when the general judgment was to take place, and also of the place of Lazarus's sepulture. It does not appear that the sect attributed this ignorance to the humanity only of Jesus Christ, and not to his divinity;—a distinction, of which they do not seem to have been aware. The passage in which our blessed Redeemer says, that the Son of Man knew not *the day nor the hour*, had heretofore been the subject of eager discussion between the catholics and the Arians, the latter of whom would needs infer from these words, that Jesus Christ was not God.

Some fathers, to do away the difficulty, answered that the Son of God meant only, by this passage, that he had no experimental knowledge of the matter. Others say, that Christ was ignorant in a certain sense—of what he did not think fit to disclose to man. He knew it not so as to communicate it to us; he wished it to remain in our regard a profound secret. Some imagine that, in fact, the *humanity* or the soul of our blessed Redeemer was ignorant of the precise day of judgment.

This latter explanation is contrary to the sentiments of the fathers; but does not amount to heresy. The soul of our Lord Jesus Christ, although personally united to the Word, is not infinite. It is true, in virtue of this union it knows whatever it has a wish to know: but as it is not infinite, it does not at one extensive view comprehend all things. Thus when Christ told his apostles that he did not know on what day precisely the general judgment would take place, very possibly he might not give any actual attention to the circumstance. (Forbes. Inst. Theol. l. 3, c. 21.) God, according to Origen, by this impenetrable secrecy in regard of the last day, desires to keep us in a constant watchfulness and state of preparation, and to repress in us a vain curiosity, and idle researches into futurity—no wise conducive to our eternal salvation. (Orig. in Matt. &c.)

AGONICELITES,—the name of a sect who pretended, that *standing* was the only proper posture for prayer, and that to bend the knee in prayer was superstition. (Stockman Lexic.)

AGRICOLA (John Isleb)—was fellow-countryman and contemporary with Luther, and his disciple. At first he abetted with much warmth the sentiments of his master. He afterwards abandoned him, and became his enemy. After a thousand variations in his doctrine and his creed; after repeatedly retracting his errors and relapsing continually into the same dogmatical inaccuracies, he revived an erroneous tenet which Luther had been forced to abjure. He had taught justification by faith alone, and that good works were not necessary in order to salvation. Hence Agricola inferred, that when once a person had obtained faith, he was no longer subject to any law, and that laws were of no use whatever to him either for reprehending or directing him; because, being justified by faith alone, good works became superfluous; and because, in the second place, if he was not actually just, he might obtain his justification by making one solitary act of faith. Agreeably to this system, Agricola inculcated the principles best adapted to command our *faith*, and not the maxims most proper for the regulation of our *conduct*. (Stockman, Lexic. Sekendolf, Hist. Luth. l. 3.)

Luther loudly condemned this doctrine; and Agricola submitted to the censure, and repented of his docility, by turns. In fact, Luther could not solidly refute his system, as long as he upheld his own principles of justification, and continued to maintain them with Agricola. The conclusions drawn by the latter were evidently deducible from Luther's principles of justification by faith. As Agricola rejected alike every species of law, his disciples were denominated Anomeans, that is a sect of men who will have nothing to do with laws.

ALBANIANS—so named from the country which gave them birth. They were a sect of the eighth age, who denied the lawfulness of any oath whatever; also, original sin, the efficacy of the sacraments, and free will: they rejected oral confession as a useless practice, and reprobated all excommunications. They were a branch of the Manichees who had rallied in Albania after their expulsion from the empire of the East; and admitted, like them, a good and an evil principle, both eternal—though absolutely contrary to each other: they moreover denied the divinity of Jesus Christ, and condemned matrimony. The Manichean heresy was widely diffused, and every where found abettors, especially in France, where the sect had an infinite number of its fanatical disciples. Ignorance was at this time extreme, and almost general. Many of the clergy were not much more enlightened than the laity, and of course not much superior to them in point of morality. The Manichees too, were equally ignorant; but had the show of external regularity in their morals and demeanour: they cried out aloud against the abuses of the times, and against the disorders of churchmen;—

topics which are sure to seduce an ignorant and discontented people.

To the almost general ignorance of the clergy and laity is due—the rapid progress of those heretical sects which inundated Europe from the period above-mentioned, and lighted up the torch of long and cruel intestine wars even down to the seventeenth century. See the articles BOGOMILES, TANCHELIN, PETER OF BRUYS, ARNOLD OF BRESCIA, ALBIGENSES, WALDENSES, STADINGI, BEGARDE, FRATRICELLI, WICKLIFFITES, HUSSITES, LUTHER, ANABAPTISTS, &c. &c.

ALBIGENSES—were Manichees who infested Languedoc towards the close of the twelfth century. The heresy of the Paulicians, or Bulgarian Manichees, was imported, originally, into France by an old woman, who found means to seduce certain persons at Orleans; other Manichees, dispersed over the southern provinces of France, communicated their errors: nor did that excessive severity with which they were punished when detected, extirpate Manicheism; it only made its votaries more circumspect and artful. They hated the clergy, and burnt with the most furious desire of revenge for those rigors which had been exercised upon them, at the instigation chiefly, as they had reason to suppose, of churchmen. To effect their purposes, they endeavoured to vilify in the eyes of the people whatever tended to conciliate respect to ecclesiastics; they ridiculed the sacraments and the ceremonies of the church, attacked the privileges of the clergy, pretended that the tithes should be withheld, and damned all clergymen indiscriminately, who possessed any funded property.

The ignorant people lent a willing ear to the insinuations of the Manichees; and, from a marked contempt of the ministers of religion, they passed on to the contempt of religion itself—its ceremonies—and its sacraments, which they received only through the medium of ecclesiastics.

The Manichees were poor, and affected in their exterior deportment great regularity: they condemned riches, and were soon regarded by an undiscerning crowd as so many apostles. Their heresy became on the sudden the favorite religion of a large proportion of both people and the nobility, in different provinces of France; especially in regard of those powerful men who had invaded the property of the church, and who were enjoined by the decrees of synods, under pain of excommunication, to restore what they had wrongfully usurped: thus in a short time did the Manichees become a formidable sect.

The Roman pontiffs sent their legates into the southern provinces of France—to arrest, if possible, the progress of this heresy. The great St Bernard was deputed thither; and he converted numbers of fanatics to the catholic faith; but he could not im-

part his spirit to the clergy ; nor his talents, nor his enlightened principles, nor his pure zeal ; and, after his departure, error acquired a more extensive range.

Its proselytes—in Provence, in Burgundy, and in Flanders, were known by the various names of Publicans, Good Men, &c. In a short time, so prodigious was their increase in Languedoc, that the kings of England and France deemed it necessary to send among them the most enlightened prelates of their respective realms, to assert the cause of religion and that of truth. Headed by the apostolical legate, they entered Toulouse amidst the insulting clamours of the populace, who complimented them with the opprobrious epithets of—heretics, hypocrites, and apostates. One of the prelates harangued the multitude, and in his discourse refuted all their errors—with such a happy effect, that, intimidated by the force of his arguments, and awed too, perhaps, by the power of the Count of Toulouse, no one dared to speak his sentiments in public, or openly to advocate the desperate cause.

This was the only good effect of the mission : a few of the most noted sectarists were excommunicated and confined ; and thus error was silenced for the moment, not reclaimed.

After similar ineffectual attempts to convert the Albigenes, in one of which the pope's legate had been assassinated, a crusade was set on foot against them. At its head appeared the Abbot of Citeaux, the Duke of Burgundy, the Counts of Nevers, of Montfort, &c. A series of the most dreadful disorders ensued ; and both parties seemed to rival each other in acts of cruelty and rapaciousness. The wretched Albigenes were eventually reduced, and treated with the utmost inhumanity to force them to abjure the errors of their sect. With the ancient Manichees they admitted two first principles or gods. The one they supposed to be the creator of things invisible, and termed him the Good Principle : the other they denominated the Evil Principle, and believed him to be the author of all things visible. The Old Testament they rejected, as the production of the latter, while they revered the authority of the gospels, as being the work of their better principle. They affirmed that all the fathers of the Old Testament were damned ; and that John the Baptist was one of the arch-demons. Others among these fanatics held only one Creator, but that he had two sons, our Saviour Christ, and the Devil. The Roman church they called *a den of thieves*, and the *whore of Babylon*—as some of our enlightened protestant brethren are pleased to term it to this day.

Among other monstrous doctrines of these miscreants, they taught that matrimony was neither more nor less than a sworn prostitution ; and that carnal commerce with a mother, a sister, or a daughter, was no greater crime than to have connection with any other woman. Their immoral theory and their prac-

tice were in perfect unison ; as we are informed by contemporary authors of unimpeached veracity. (See Lucas Tudensis, Gulielmus de Nangis, Petrus de Valle Cernaii, &c.)

It would be tedious and disgusting to the pious reader to detail in full the various impieties of this diabolical heresy. What has made Mons. Basnage strain every nerve to exculpate the Albigenses from the imputation of Manicheism, is their holding also the Sacramentarian doctrines, in opposition to the catholic church. Catholics need not envy the Reformed such glorious precursors. In fact, Basnage has proved only, that in Languedoc there existed sectaries—of principles diametrically opposed to the Manichees. This indeed, no body ever contested. 'The province was overrun with sectaries of various denominations.' But, that sect in particular, denoted by the appellation of Albigenses, against which the crusade was formed, were evidently Manichees—from the concurrent testimony of all the monuments of those times, the councils, the interrogatories then instituted, and the distinction always expressly made between the Albigenses, the Waldenses and other fanatics of the day. Nor were the Albigenses themselves uniform in their system of faith, and much less so in their moral conduct. The life of their *predestinate* was extremely austere ; and their doctors had taught the silly people to believe, that if they could but recite the *our Father* at the hour of dissolution, and obtain *their* benediction, nothing more was requisite for their admission into heaven, and the full atonement of all their crimes.

AMAURI,—was a native of the diocese of Chartres, and had received clerical orders. He made considerable progress in the study of philosophy at Paris, and taught with reputation at the commencement of the thirteenth century. The works of Aristotle were then fashionable in France ; and all the Arabian philosophers had adopted him for their guide in the study of logic, which was at that time almost the sole department of philosophy in general cultivation at the schools. Amauri's curiosity impelled him to examine also the metaphysical and physical compositions of that ingenious pagan philosopher ; and in his researches concerning the formation and origin of the universe, he chose to follow his own conjectures, rather than the light of revelation, which, however, he pretended to reconcile with the system of Aristotle, or—to speak more accurately—with that of his disciple Strato. Strato combining the various opinions of his master Aristotle, attempted to account for the existence of all things in the universe by supposing matter to have been endowed with an inherent principle of motion from eternity. This absurd system was embraced, in after ages, by some Arabian commentators of Aristotle ; and ascribed to him. It had been imported into the West together with the writings of these philosophers.

It is said, that the famous John Scotus Erigena had taught—that there was but one substance in the world ;—which was primeval matter, and to which he gave the name of God. This was also Amauri's impious and extravagant opinion, and with it he affected to identify the sacred narrative of Holy Scripture.

The university of Paris exclaimed aloud against the upholder of such doctrine ; and Amauri appealed from its decision to the Roman pontiff, who approved the sentence of the university. To the papal authority Amauri thought fit to acquiesce, and retired to the monastery of St Martin, where he ended his days in sullenness and remorse: (See Gul. Armorii, Hist. de vit. Philip. ad an. 1209, d'Argentré loc. cit. S. Th. contr. Gent. c. 17.) Such is the extravagance and such the obstinacy of systematic pride ! Amauri left behind him a disciple called David de Dinant. See this article.

ANABAPTISTS—so called from their *re-baptising* those who had received baptism in their infancy. According to Luther, the *sacraments* could not effect the justification of christians ; but only the *faith* of the receiver. From this principle, Stork, one of Luther's disciples, concluded that infants could not be justified by the sacrament of baptism, and that it was necessary to re-baptise all who had been baptised in their infancy ; because at that time they were incapable of forming an act of faith, by which alone a christian applies to himself the merits of Jesus Christ, conformably to Luther's system. The latter had established his doctrine neither upon tradition, nor upon the decisions of councils, nor upon the authority of the fathers ; but, as he declared, upon scripture alone. Stork observed that infant baptism was not mentioned in holy scripture ; on the contrary, that previous instruction seemed there to be insinuated, as necessary ; and that persons were actually to believe when admitted to the font. Hence he inferred, that infant baptism was an anti-scriptural practice ; and that those who had been baptised in their infancy, had not, in fact, received the sacrament at all.

Some colleges among the reformed patronised this new doctrine ; and it began, at length, to be published from the pulpit. Stork, the better to vindicate his opinion, availed himself of the fundamental maxim of the reform, namely, that nothing ought to pass for revealed doctrine necessary to salvation, which was not contained in holy scripture : as for fathers, councils, and divines, together with polite literature in general,—all these he discarded as polluted sources, and maintained that learning only filled the heart with pride, and the brain with science altogether useless and replete with danger. Thus he secured the suffrages of the ignorant, the stupid, and the mob, who were all well pleased to see themselves dubbed doctors of theology by this

agreeable conceit of their new apostle. As Luther had farther insinuated, that the Holy Ghost had inspired him with extraordinary lights; and that similar inspirations were not refused to those who asked them; Stork declared that these same inspirations and interior admonitions of the Divine Spirit were the rule of faith and conduct to every true believer. Carlostadius, Muncer, and other protestants, adopted the principles of Stork; and the Anabaptists now formed at Wirtemberg itself a powerful sect. At the head of this sect, Carlostadius and Muncer, in their pious zeal, flew from church to church to destroy the pictures and images of the saints, and abolished every remnant of the catholic worship which Luther had thought fit to leave inviolate. Luther hastened out of his retreat; preached against the Anabaptists, and caused Muncer, Stork, and Carlostadius, to be banished Wirtemberg. Carlostadius retired into Switzerland, where he laid the foundation of the doctrine of the Sacramentarians; while Stork and Muncer dogmatised in Suabia, Thuringia and Franconia, and every where disseminated their new gospel; preaching alike against Luther and the pope. The latter, according to Stork, overwhelmed the consciences of christians with a multitude of practices,—to say the least, superfluous: the former authorised a scandalous relaxation of christian morality in contradiction to the gospel, and a dissolution not inferior to that of Mahometism. The Anabaptists gave it out, that they had received a commission from above to abolish the too severe religion of the pope, and the licentious sectarianism of Luther: the whole duty of a perfect christian, they said, consisted in a life exempt from pride and ambition, and free from vice.

Stork and Muncer now conceived the design of forming in the heart of Germany a new and independent monarchy; while some of their brethren, of more pacific dispositions, thought it criminal to stand upon their own defence even against the most wanton and unprovoked attacks of their enemies. The people of Mulhausen respected Muncer as a prophet, divinely commissioned to free them from oppression. They expelled their magistrates, declared all property to be common stock, and proclaimed Muncer judge of Israel. This new Samuel wrote to the sovereigns and various states of Europe, to notify to them that the time was now come when a final period should be put to the oppression of the people and the tyranny of kings; and that God had commanded him to exterminate the whole race of tyrants, and to establish over the people men of virtue and real merit. The flame of sedition quickly spread over the greatest part of Germany; and Muncer soon found himself at the head of a formidable army; whole districts suddenly rising in rebellion and flying to his standard. The disorders committed by this religious banditti, alarmed the princes of the neighbouring

states, and forced them to take the field. At their head was the Landgrave of Hesse, who fell upon Muncer before he could be joined by the several bodies of insurgents on their march to reinforce him. Muncer was discomfited; and more than seven thousand Anabaptists perished on this occasion. Their fanatic leader was himself taken, and a short time after executed. (See Catrou, Hist. des Anab. Sleidam, l. 10, Seckendorf Comment. Hist. &c.) The defeat and death of Muncer did not extinguish Anabaptism in Germany: the party, indeed, was no longer formidable; although it seemed even to increase in numbers. Its sectaries, odious alike to catholics, to protestants and sacramentarians, were persecuted and defamed throughout the German territories. In Switzerland, the Low Countries, and in Holland, they were treated with still greater rigor; numbers were put to death, and the prisons were crowded with these poor deluded people. Their enthusiasm, however, could not be subdued by terror; and they still continued to increase. From time to time there appeared among them impostors who promised them more happy times. Matthewson, a baker at Haarlem, sent ten apostles into Friesland, to Munster and other places. At Munster were already some Anabaptist proselytes, who received the new apostles as emissaries from heaven. They all assembled together in a body at night; and Matthewson's vice-deputy conferred upon them the apostolic spirit, which they were eagerly waiting to receive. They appeared not much in public, till their numbers were greatly augmented; when they suddenly ran up and down the country exclaiming: *Repent ye, and do penance and be baptised, that the wrath of God may not fall upon you.* The spirit of fanaticism was quickly diffused; and when the magistrates set forth an ordinance against them, the Anabaptists flew to arms, and seized upon the market-place: the townsmen took their post in another quarter of the city. Thus they guarded each other during three days; till they at length agreed to lay down their arms, and that both parties should mutually tolerate each other, notwithstanding their difference of sentiments in matters of religion.

Meanwhile the Anabaptists dispatched secret messages to different parts, informing by letter their adherents, that a prophet inspired by the Holy Spirit was come to Munster; that he predicted marvellous events, and instructed men in the true method of saving their souls. In consequence of this intelligence a prodigious number of Anabaptists repaired to Munster; upon which several of the party ran up and down the streets, crying out with all their might: *Retire all ye wicked from this place, if you wish to escape entire destruction: all those who refuse to be rebaptised, will be knocked on the head.* The clergy and the natives then abandoned the town; and the Anabaptists pillaged the churches and forsaken houses; and committed to the flames all books in-

discriminately, except the Bible. Soon after the town was besieged; and Matthewson sallying out upon the assailants, was himself numbered among the slain. His death was a thunder-bolt to the party; till John Becold revived their drooping spirits by running naked through the streets, and crying out: *the king of Sion is at hand*. After this extraordinary frolic, he retired to his lodgings, and dressed himself as ordinary; but stirred not out of doors. The next morning the people attended in crouds to learn the cause of so mysterious a proceeding. John Becold answered not a word; but signified in writing, that God had enjoined him silence for three days. The term of his mutism was expected with impatience; and then with a prophetic tone he declared to the people, that God had commanded him to establish twelve judges over Israel. He named them, and introduced in the government of Munster whatever alterations he thought fit.

When the impostor deemed himself sufficiently secure of the good opinion of the multitude, a certain goldsmith presented himself before the judges, and said to them: "Hear what the Lord God eternal saith. As heretofore I established Saul king of Israel, and after him David, although he was but a simple shepherd; so I this day establish my prophet Becold, king in Sion." Another prophet stepped forth and presented him with a sword, saying: "God establisheth thee king, not of Sion only, but of all the earth." The credulous people, in transports of joy, proclaimed the new king of Sion, and caused a crown of gold to be made for the occasion, and money to be coined in his name.

Without loss of time, Becold dispatched twenty-six apostles to their various destinations, with commission every where to propagate his empire. Confusion and disorder marked the progress of these new missionaries, particularly in Holland, where John of Leyden pretended that God had made him a present of Amsterdam, and of several other cities. Here the Anabaptists, after exciting much tumult and sedition, were many of them punished with death. The king of Sion learnt with extreme concern the deplorable mischances of his apostles. All was now despondency in Munster: the town was taken, and king Becold himself was put to an ignominious and cruel death. Thus terminated the reign of Anabaptism at Munster, in the year 1536.

For many years afterwards, a sanguinary persecution raged against the sect in Holland. Nor were they treated with less severity in England. In Germany and Switzerland, they found means incessantly to repair their daily losses; while nothing but the most determined fanaticism could rescue them from utter destruction. Taught, however, by their dreadful disasters, they at length began to wave their extravagant pretensions to universal monarchy, and to unite themselves with their more pacific brethren. The denomination of *Pacific* was given to

those Anabaptists whose peaceful dispositions inclined them to retire from society, and to form apart an establishment purely religious. Of this character were Hutter, Gabriel and Menno, who instituted the confraternities of the brethren of Moravia and the Mennonites. Hutter and Gabriel, both of them disciples of Stork, purchased in Moravia an extensive district of fertile though uncultivated soil. After which they travelled through Silesia, Bohemia, Stiria and Switzerland, declaring to all, that God had chosen a people according to his own heart; and that this people was dispersed among the nations of infidelity: but that the time to gather together the children of Israel was now come, and that it behoved all true believers to abandon Egypt, and pass into the Land of Promise.

Having thus formed a society sufficiently numerous, Hutter drew up a symbol of belief, and a code of laws. The symbol purported—1. That God in every age had chosen to himself a holy nation, which he had made the depository of the true religion; that this people was undoubtedly the very same which he (Hutter) was now collecting from among the children of perdition, to settle in Moravia—the Land of Promise; and that, finally,—to abandon the chief, or to neglect the ordinances of the conductor of Israel, was a certain prelude to damnation.—2. That all societies which do not hold their property in common, are to be reputed impious.—3. That Jesus Christ is not God, but only a prophet.—4. That christians must acknowledge no other magistrates than the pastors of the church.—5. That almost all the exterior marks of religion are contrary to the spirit of christianity; and that it is unlawful to keep images. 6. That all who are not re-baptised, are in fact infidels; and that the marriages contracted before this new regeneration, are annulled by the engagement which is therein made with Jesus Christ.—7. That baptism does not do away original sin, nor confer grace; but is only a sign by which every christian submits his person to the government of the church. 8. That the mass is an invention of Satan; purgatory a dream; the invocation of saints an injury offered to Almighty God; and that the body of Jesus Christ is not really present in the eucharist.

Such were the doctrines of the Anabaptists who under Hutter took the name of Brethren of Moravia, the place of their chief settlement. After various reverses, Hutter was arrested and condemned to the stake. From that moment the Anabaptists of Moravia began to lose their primitive fervor; and their colonies sunk into indolence and every species of vice. About the year 1620, the Moravian community was almost totally suppressed. Vast numbers retired into Transylvania, and were incorporated with the Socinians. Many also of the Moravian brethren, after the Quakers had settled on the continent of North America, and opened an asylum for all christian sects of

whatever denomination, quitted Europe for that new hemisphere of the globe, where they still continue undisturbed.

Another branch of Anabaptists, upon the extinction of their kingdom of Munster, united under the conduct of one Menno, who relinquished a curacy in Friesland, to become their bishop. So active was his zeal, that in a short time he made great multitudes of proselytes—in Friesland, Westphalia, Guelders, Holland, Brabant and divers other places, notwithstanding the rigours of persecution employed against them. The Mennonites, however, soon disagreed among themselves, mutually thundering out excommunications against each other; nor could their differences be terminated by the decrees of their synods, nor even by the hardships which they had to suffer from the other sects of reformers, and from the magistrates. The Mennonites now consist of two distinct societies in Holland—the Waterlanders and the Flamanders. In these are comprehended the Frison and German Mennonites, who are the genuine sect of the ancient Anabaptists, although they are more temperate than were their predecessors in Germany and Switzerland. Among the Flamanders are found great numbers of Socinians. In 1664, they were forbidden by the authority of the then existing government to dispute concerning the divinity of Jesus Christ.

In general, the Mennonite Anabaptists acknowledge the divinity of Jesus Christ, but refuse obedience to the church, the councils, or any ecclesiastical assembly whatever. They reject *infant* baptism, and maintain that no society has an exclusive right to the title of true church; and that Luther's reformation cannot be reputed the handy work of God. They admit the necessity of obeying the civil magistrate, although they will not allow to *churchmen* any authority by divine right, and say, that excommunication, ever since the time of the apostles who alone, according to them, were established by Almighty God, has been of no effect. In 1660, the Anabaptists of Alsace subscribed to the confession of faith held by the Flandrican Anabaptists. Those of Hambourg maintain the same religious code with the Waterlanders.

It was a fundamental principle of Anabaptism, that God was the immediate instructor of the faithful, and that the holy spirit himself directed them in their belief and practice. Agreeably to this principle, each individual Anabaptist mistook his own private conceits, however extravagant they might be, for so many revealed truths. Hence arose among them a variety of sects, whose creeds accorded only in one solitary article, namely, that those who had been already baptised before their conversion, ought to be baptised a second time. In other instances, they had each their peculiar practices, which they severally deemed necessary to salvation.

1. The ADAMITES, for instance, believed a state of nudity essential to a future well-being; and three hundred of these maniacs went up into a high mountain stark naked, with the silly persuasion that they would thence be translated, body and soul, into heaven.

2. The APOSTOLICS—thought it essential literally to fulfil the precept of Jesus Christ to his apostles, when he ordered them to preach from the top of houses. Accordingly, as often as they wished to exhort their audience to holiness of life, they very nimbly stationed themselves upon the ridge of some roof, and would have no other pulpit, whence to harangue the wondering croud.

3. The TACITURN, on the other hand, were persuaded, that those unhappy times predicted by St Paul, were now come, when the gospel would be no longer heard: and, in consequence, observed the most obstinate silence, if interrogated concerning religion, or—what course was to be pursued in these times of difficulty.

4. The PERFECT—imagined that, to have an air of serenity or satisfaction, or in the least to smile, would be drawing upon oneself that curse of Jesus Christ:—*Wo to you that laugh, for you shall weep.* They had retired from the society of men, in order to comply with the precept of *not conforming to the world.*

5. The INNOCENTS or IMPECCABLE—held, that after their new regeneration they could with ease preserve themselves from the smallest stain of sin, and that in fact they did live entirely exempt. Hence they retrenched from the Lord's Prayer the following petition—and *forgive us our trespasses*; and desired not the prayers of others in their own behalf.

6. The LIBERTINES—pretended, that every kind of subjection was contrary to the spirit of christianity.

7. The SABBATARIANS taught, that the ancient Sabbath, which was Saturday and not Sunday, ought to be observed by christians.

8. The CLANCULARIANS—maintained, that in public we ought to profess the same religious creed with our neighbours, and speak our real sentiments only in private.

9. The MANIFESTARIANS—adopted exactly the reverse of this doctrine.

10. The WEEPERS—fancied that continual tears were most pleasing to God, and turned all their efforts towards obtaining the art of weeping: they always mingled their tears with their bread, and were never without sighs and groans in conversation.

11. The REJOICERS—on the contrary, laid it down as a principle, that merriment and good cheer were the most agreeable offering that could be made to Almighty God.

12. The INDIFFERENT—had not finally embraced any particular system of religion, and thought all religions equally good.

13. The **SANGUINARIANS**—wished for nothing so ardently, as the shedding of the blood both of catholics and protestants.

14. The **ANTIMARIANS**—refused to render any kind of religious veneration to the blessed Virgin Mary.—See Hist. Mennotarum, Descript. d'Amsterdam; Catrou, Hist. des Anabap. in—12 sur d'excellens memoires a Amsterdam. Kromayer, in Scrutinio Religionum Pantheon Anabaptisticum et Enthusiasticum 1702 in Fol. The German theologians are very copious upon this subject. (See their account in Stockman, Lexic. Hæres.)

ANDRONICIANS,—so named from their author Andronicus who adopted the errors of the Severians. Among other reveries, they maintained, that the superior part of the female was the work of God, but that the rest was the production of the devil. (Epiph. Hær. 45. See the article **SEVERIANS**.)

ANGELICS—were a sect of the apostolic age. Of them the apostle St Paul seems to speak in his epistle to the Colossians, 2. v. 18, *Let no man seduce you, rendering, out of a false humility, a superstitious worship unto angels*, like the infidel philosophers who honored their genii (or angels) as inferior divinities; imagining that God was too great to be addressed by men. Some christians, agreeably to these pagan notions, deemed the mediatorship of the angels more powerful with God, and better calculated to reconcile man with his offended Maker, than even that of Jesus Christ. (See Theodoret, Theophilact. Menoch. S. Chrys. Hom. 7. Col. 2. Stockman, Lexic. &c.) The sect was in being during the reign of Severus, and down to the year 357 or 367, when Theodoret remarks, that the worship of angels which some false apostles had established in Phrygia and Pisidia, had there taken so deep root, that the council of Laodicea expressly forbade christians to address any prayer to the angels. This, however, is not altogether accurate; for the council says only, that “Christians must not abandon the church of God, to go to invoke the angels, and frequent private conventicles.” (Calmet, Comment. sur St Paul, Ép. aux Col. 2. 18 and dissert. sur les bons et les mauvais Anges.)

ANOMIANS—taught that the Son and the Holy Ghost were in all things *unlike* the Father. From this circumstance is derived their name which in the Greek tongue signifies *unlike*. See the article **Eunomians**.

ANTHIASISTS—deemed it criminal to labor, and passed their life in indolence and inaction. Philastrius, who mentions these sectaries, could not ascertain the period of their existence.

ANTHROPOMORPHITES or ANTHROPIANS,—fancied that God had a human body. They grounded their opinion upon a passage in the book of Genesis, in which God says—*Come let us make man to our own image and likeness*; also upon all the other passages of holy writ which attribute hands, eyes, feet and other human parts, to Almighty God. (Nicephorus, l. 11, c. 14, l. 13, c. 10, Ittig. de Hær.) This heresy began to show itself as early as the fourth age, and re-appeared at the commencement of the tenth. The tenth century, branded with great reason for its peculiar ignorance and stupidity, was incapable of producing any errors but such as this. Men's intellects were too dull to conceive any thing which could not be represented under corporal forms. Angels were supposed to be in fact—*men with wings*, as seen in paintings on the walls of churches; and the more ignorant sort imagined, that every thing passed in much the same way above, as here below. Some believed that St Michael celebrated mass in the presence of the divine Majesty every Monday; and on that account, they frequented his church on this day rather than on any other. (Hist. Littéraire de France, l. 5, p. 10.)

ANTIMARIANITES, or *Antidicomarianites*—a name given to those who denied the virginity of the mother of our Blessed Redeemer, and pretended that she had other children by Joseph, because it is said in the gospel, that Jesus Christ had some brethren. (See HELVIDIUS. Epiph. Hær. 78.)

ANTINOMIANS—a term importing—*enemies of the law*. See AGRICOLA, their first author.

ANTIOCHIANISM, or the schism of Antioch—continued upwards of eighty years. Its origin was as follows:—The Arians having expelled Eustathius, bishop of Antioch, intruded Eudoxius into his see. Eudoxius was a bigotted Arian; and numbers of zealous catholics still adhered to Eustathius. After his death, upon Eudoxius's being translated to Constantinople, much party-work and intrigue ensued at Antioch in the nomination of a new bishop; till all at length agreed to raise Meletius to the episcopal dignity. Meletius, in his sermons, reprobated Arianism, and was banished in consequence. The Arians then chose Euzoius, a furious stickler of their party; and those catholics who were attached to Meletius, from that period began to hold their assemblies apart. Thus was Antioch divided into three distinct parties; that of the catholics who acknowledged Eustathius for their lawful pastor, and refused to communicate either with the Arians, or with the catholics attached to Meletius; because they considered him as intruded by the Arian faction: the second party consisted of the latter description of

catholics; and the third was that of the Arians. On the accession of Julian the apostate to the empire, the exiled catholic prelates were suffered to return from banishment; and Lucifer of Cagliari, one of that number, and legate to the pope, taking Antioch in his way, ordained Paulinus bishop; conceiving, that the catholics attached to Meletius would readily join themselves to Paulinus. He was disappointed of his expectations; and the schism was perpetuated—though without any real difference in doctrinal points, till the year 339.

The ANTITACTÆ—were heretics who deemed it a part of duty to practise whatever was prohibited in holy scripture. They were a branch of Cainites, and made their first appearance about the year 160. Their morality was of a piece with their impious and abandoned principles. (See CAINITES. Thedoret, Hær. l. 1. c. 16. Ittigius de Hær. sect. 2, c. 16. Bibl. Aut. Eccles. sæc. 2, art. 6.)

ANTITRINITARIANS—are all those, in globo, who deny the mystery of the most Blessed Trinity.

Revelation informs us, that there are three divine persons,—the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost,—existing in one divine substance. In this consists the mystery of the Blessed Trinity. The union of the three persons in one only individual substance, simple and uncompounded, includes the whole difficulty of this mystery. The mystery itself is denied two ways;—either by supposing that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, are not three persons, but different names only, given to the self-same thing;—or, by supposing that these three persons are three distinct substances. The abbot Joachim; some Socinian ministers; Sherlock, Whiston, and Clark, imagined it equally impossible, not to recognise in the sacred writings—the existence of three divine persons, and to unite them in one simple and individual substance. Hence they erroneously concluded the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, to be three distinct substances. Sabellius, on the other hand, and Praxeas, with Servetus and Socinus, maintained it inconsistent with reason and revelation, to suppose the existence of a plurality of substances in the Godhead, or to unite in one simple substance—three persons essentially distinct. This false idea led them to deduce an inference equally erroneous:—that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, were not persons, but mere denominations attributed to the divinity, in order to characterise its various operations *ad extra*. Hence the Antitrinitarians are of two kinds;—the Tritheists, who contend that the three divine persons are so many distinct substances; and the Unitarians, who maintain that the three persons are

merely different denominations of the same divine substance. The brevity which we have prescribed to ourselves in this small treatise, will not allow us to enter into the intricacies of theological discussion concerning this incomprehensible mystery of the christian religion, handed down to us from the primitive ages of the church as a fundamental article of faith. (See ARIANS and MACEDONIANS.) We will beg leave only to observe, that the church has invariably condemned—both those who believed the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, to be merely three different denominations of the divine substance;—and those who maintained them to be three distinct substances. Whence it plainly follows, that the church has always maintained the doctrine of the Blessed Trinity, as we do at this day. Catholic divines have solidly refuted the Socinian objections against this mystery. Among others, the great Bossuet and Petavius may be read with satisfaction upon the subject. Our English theologians too, have many of them eminently distinguished themselves in the defence of this grand point of christian doctrine. (See particularly Isaaci Barrow opuscula.)

The author of the *Letters* upon what he conceives *Essential* in *Religion* is pleased to contradict all christian antiquity, when he pretends that the words—Trinity and Persons—ought to be suppressed, and declares, he looks upon this dogma as perfectly superfluous. Had he been better acquainted with the history of the christian *religion* and its *essence*, he would have thought far otherwise. The whole economy of the christian religion supposes this mystery; and the christian cannot know what he owes to God, if he does not know how the three persons of the Blessed Trinity concur in effecting his salvation. Consequently, this mystery was revealed to us—not to be the object of our speculations,—but to impress upon our mind more forcibly, some idea of the love of God for man. And can such an impression—impelling us to fulfil the duties of religion,—be deemed superfluous?

APELLES—was a disciple of the heretic Marcion, towards the middle of the second century. In opposition, however, to his master's doctrine of two principles, he by a kind of instinct—for which he acknowledges himself unable to account—admitted only one. This he conceived to be an eternal and necessary Being. To explain the origin of evil consistently with the ideas which he had formed to himself, he imagined, that this divine Being was totally indifferent with regard to what passed among men; that he had created a multitude of angels, and among the rest, one whom Apelles denominated an Angel of Fire. The latter, he supposed, had created our sublunary world upon the model of a higher and more perfect one. But as this Creator happened to be himself not very good, it happened also very

naturally, that the world which he produced was not much better. He acknowledged that Jesus Christ was son of the supreme God, and that he descended from heaven in these latter times together with the Holy Ghost, to save those that should believe in him, and to instruct them in the knowledge of heavenly things; as well as to teach them to despise the Creator and all his works. Thus, the doctrine of Apelles had some affinity with that of Marcion. But he did not hold with him, that Christ had assumed a mere phantastic body. However, in order to make him independent of the Creator, he pretended that Jesus Christ had formed unto himself a body composed of parts, which he had borrowed from each of the celestial regions through which he passed in his descent upon earth; and that on his return to the upper world, he had restored to each of the heavens what had been taken thence. Against the absurd errors of Apelles, Tertullian wrote a learned book which is not now extant. Rhodo likewise refuted his system. At the same time he informs us, how he could not help holding in contempt—a person, who was unable to allege any proof of his own doctrine; there being nothing more ridiculous than one who wishes to commence teacher of other men, while himself is at a loss how to account for his own eccentric opinions. (Rhodo. apud Euseb. l. 5, c. 13. Epiph. Hær. 44. Aug. Hær. 23. Tert. de Præscript. c. 30, 31. Baron. ad an. 146.)

APELLITES—were the sectarists of Apelles. See last article.

APHTHARTODOCTÆ—disciples of Julian of Halicarnassus, who pretended that our Redeemer's body was incapable of suffering, and incorruptible: they appeared about the year 365. (Niceph. l. 17, c. 29. Dāmascen.)

APOLLINARIS—bishop of Laodicea, after having been one of the most zealous defenders of the consubstantiality of the Son of God, which he had proved against the Arians by an infinite number of passages in holy scripture ascribing to Jesus Christ all the attributes of the divinity,—denied that he had any human soul, and imagined that the divinity had supplied its place. But, observing that our Blessed Redeemer had experienced within himself impressions which could not apply immediately to the divinity, he fancied, that Christ must have had a *sensitive* soul—agreeably to the Pythagorean system which supposes in man a rational soul, or a pure intelligence not subject to the tumult of the passions; and another, incapable of reason, and merely sensitive.

It is very easy to refute this error; for holy scripture plainly teaches, that Jesus Christ was man; and that he became like to men—in all things saving only sin. (Heb. 4. 15.) It informs

us, that in his childhood he increased in wisdom as he advanced in age. (Luc. ii. 40.) This must be understood, necessarily, of his rational soul: the divinity could not receive any accession of wisdom;—nor could a soul merely sensitive, acquire new lights. Although this is self-evident, Mr Whiston chose to err with Apollinaris; and asserts that the divinity itself suffered. He affects to recommend his strange opinion to all christians, and pretends it was the doctrine of the fathers who flourished since the council of Nice. But he does not appear to have made many proselytes.

Apollinaris was in universal estimation as one of the first characters of his age, in learning, erudition and piety. Hence we should be very diffident of our own lights, and very tender with regard to the religious errors of our fellow-creatures; since neither science, nor genius, nor piety itself secures us against mistakes.

Apollinaris flourished about the close of the fourth age, under Julian. His heresy was first condemned in the council of Alexandria, held in the year 362 under St Athanasius—after the death of Constantius: it proscribed the heresy; but did not name its author. Pope Damasus also condemned the doctrine of Apollinaris, and afterwards proceeded to his deposition. His sentiments were again examined and anathematized by the second general council at Constantinople. They were refuted by St Athanasius, the two SS Gregories—of Nazianzum and Nyssa, Theodoret, and St Ambrose.

APOLLINARISTS—the sectaries of Apollinaris. See last article.

APOSTOLICS—a branch of the ancient Encratites, who boasted their perfect imitation of the apostles. Those petty sects of reformers in the twelfth century, who dispersed themselves over the different provinces of France, were likewise denominated Apostolics. See the articles **ALBIGENSES** and **WALDENSES**.

These latter sects maintained respectively—errors absolutely irreconcilable with each other, and often adopted contradictory practices. They were all condemned in various councils assembled in order to suppress their errors; which they maintained with such determined obstinacy, under the severest hardships, that Ervin was at a loss to account—how the members of Satan should exhibit as striking instances of constancy in so bad a cause, as the faithful had done in dying for the truth.

The sect of the Apostolics was renewed by a person from the very dregs of the people named Segarel, who to imitate, as he pretended, our Blessed Saviour Jesus Christ, caused himself to be swathed, rocked in a cradle, and suckled at the breast! He was attended by troops of idle vagabonds, who had all things even to their *wives*, in common. The punishments of their

leader did not extinguish this absurd and immoral sect. Some Anabaptists also, went by the name of Apostolics. See ANA-BAPTISTS.

APOTACTICS—a species of Encratites or Tatians, who to the common errors of the Encratites added the necessity of renouncing, absolutely—all worldly possessions, and maintained all to be reprobates who retained them. Some of these sectaries were in existence towards the decline of the second century, in Cilicia and Pamphilia. See the foregoing articles.

AQUATICS—were heretics who imagined, that water was a principle coeternal with God himself;—a doctrine which Her-mogenes had advanced with respect to matter in general, in order to supply the Creator of this visible world with materials for its formation. His disciples had proceeded to investigate the nature of this primeval matter; and, it would seem, they had adopted the system of Thales who imagined water to be the principle of all things. Thus was human wit, after having raised itself by the aid of religion above the fanciful speculations of the ancient philosophers, reconducted to those senseless theories once relinquished as untenable,—through a vain and restless curiosity of prying too minutely into things beyond its sphere. See Stockman's Lexicon, upon the article in question.

ARA—a sectarist who pretended, that Christ himself was not exempt from the stain of original sin. (Eus. Hist. l. 6, c. 37. Aug. de Hæres. c. 38. Niceph. Hist. l. 5, c. 23.)

ARABIANS—the denomination of a sect which in the third age combated the immortality of the soul. They did not, however, deny the existence of a future state: they asserted only, that the soul died together with the body, and with it would rise again to life. Upon this subject was convoked a numerous synod in Arabia, at which the famous Origen assisted: he spoke on this occasion with so much moderation and sober reasoning, that those who had embraced the erroneous doctrine of the sect, renounced it upon the spot.

ARIANS—the followers of Arius who, at the commencement of the fourth age, denied the divinity of Jesus Christ; adding that the Son was a creature, and made out of nothing; that there was a time when he did not exist; and that he was capable of sin,—with other similar impieties. Arius was a curate of Alexandria, and engaged in his errors two other curates of the city, twelve deacons, seven priests, and two Lybian bishops. The holy patriarch St Alexander, after using in vain the mildest

expostulations and the most tender remonstrances in order to reclaim him, called a council at Alexandria, in which Arius boldly maintained his errors. The fathers proceeded to refute these principles, and to pronounce their canonical condemnation. "If, say they, the Word be a creature, he has then the imperfections of a creature; he is subject to all its several vicissitudes,—is not all-powerful: his knowledge is circumscribed; for these imperfections are appendages essential to the creature, however perfect we may suppose it to be." The consequences were too obvious for Arius to mistake them. The council proved the falsehood of his doctrine from the various passages of Holy Scripture which ascribe to the Word immutability and omniscience, and those which expressly declare, that *by* Him and *for* Him all things were made, and that—*without* Him, nothing that hath existence was created. To the evidence of these proofs from Holy Scripture, the fathers of the council added the consentient doctrine of the universal church, which had invariably taught the divinity of the Word, and retrenched from its communion those that controverted it. The council defined accordingly,—that the Word was God, and co-eternal with the Father: it reprobated the doctrine of Arius, and anathematized his person. Arius found means by artful and insinuating letters to interest some prelates in his favor, and continued to disseminate his blasphemous opinions. His stature was majestic, his body meagre, and his countenance seriously reserved. Grave in his deportment, strictly clerical in his dress, he notwithstanding, possessed the art of pleasing in conversation, and excelled in poetry and music. He composed spiritual canticles for the labouring poor and devotees, and thus effectually spread the poison of his heresy among the people. By the same method had Valentinus and Armonius propagated their blasphemies before him; and it has often been adopted with success by sectaries of the present day. (See Ernesti Cypriani dissert. de Propagatione Hæresium per Cantilenas, Lond. 1720. in-8.)

The holy bishop Alexander was indefatigable in writing to prevent the spread of Arius's doctrine, and to admonish the faithful of its pernicious tendency. At this period the Roman empire was in the hands of Constantine, who ordered a general assembly of the bishops dispersed throughout his vast domains to re-examine Arius's cause, and to pass their final decision at Nice, in the year of our Lord 325. This venerable synod condemned the Arian system, and refuted Arius's impious opinions, while Constantine issued a decree of banishment against those who should refuse to subscribe the doctrine of the council. Here the spirit of innovation should have paused, had the pride of dogmatising known how to bend to legitimate authority. That church which Christ had commanded all to hear and to obey, now solemnly discarded error, and pointed out the truth. The Arian party, intimidated by the imperial decrees, pretended

acquiescence, and used all the mean artifices of dissimulation, flattery and intrigue,—to surprise the emperor, if possible, into an approbation of their impieties. They succeeded but too well—in making him believe them men of virtue and orthodox in their sentiments, although they had a difficulty in subscribing to the *consubstantiality* of the Son of God. After Constantine's decease, they found means to engage Constantius in their errors; and, under him and the succeeding emperors—to the period when Theodosius the Great was associated in the empire, all things remained in the utmost confusion in the East; and during the most considerable part of this term, Arianism filled the provinces with tumult, and the towns with slaughter: after which it dwindled into insignificance, and gradually disappeared. From the close of the fourth century there was not to be found one solitary individual Arian bishop, or private church in the whole extent of the Roman empire. Socrates, Sozomen and Theodoret attest this fact. Some few ecclesiastics and laymen, however, still continued in a private capacity to maintain the doctrine of Arius; but they no longer formed a distinct society.

Arianism survived till a later period among the Goths, whom it had begun to implicate in its errors before the death of Constantine; likewise among the Vandals who conquered Africa, and the Burgundians who received them from the Goths. This people shewed not less zeal in propagating the Arian tenets, than in extending the limits of their empire. They put to death the greatest part of the catholic bishops, and employed against their religion whatever a wild fanaticism could suggest—to barbarians devoid alike of humanity and justice. (Sidonius, l. 7. Ep. 6. ed. Simond. p. 1023.)

The Burgundians who had settled in Gaul towards the commencement of the fifth century, and had a few years after received a tincture of the catholic faith, about the middle of the same century inclined to Arianism. But being of a less ferocious disposition than the Goths, they listened to the wise instructions of certain learned and virtuous prelates; as was, for instance, St Avitus; by whom King Sigismond was reclaimed, and the whole Burgundian nation was restored to the catholic communion. (Adonis Chronic. t. 6, Bib. Patrum.)

The Franks too, had been engaged in Arianism upon their quitting idol-worship; for the distance between idolatry and Arianism is not so great, as from heathenism to the doctrine of the *consubstantiality* of the Son of God. But when Clovis embraced the catholic faith, Arianism insensibly vanished out of France. It has been renewed in these latter times, issuing forth from the womb of fanaticism, made prolific by the boasted reformation. A certain Anabaptist preacher denied the divinity of Jesus Christ, and humourously conceived himself to be grandson to the Almighty. This visionary and maniac had his

disciples, as well as the rest of the reforming prophets; and the principles of Protestantism quickly conducted its theologians into the errors of the Arian system. Scripture, according to the Protestant principle, is the sole rule of faith, and each private individual is its interpreter. Consequently, he is judge also, of the controversies appertaining to religion. By this fundamental maxim of the reform, each particular protestant was constituted eventually—judge of the catholic church, and even of the reformation itself; had the privilege of arraigning before his own tribunal, and of condemning, if he deemed fit,—the whole doctrine of every christian community, unless he should recognise in it the characters of revelation, or should he fancy it absurd. Guided by such fallacious principles, Capito, with other Lutherans, and Servetus, respectively proceeded to discuss in their private capacity, and without appeal,—the profoundest mysteries of religion; rejected that of the most Holy Trinity, and controverted the consubstantiality of the Son. Thus was Arianism spread through Germany and Poland,—divided into a vast number of collateral branches,—propagated over Holland, and wafted into our island through the medium of Okinus, Bucer, Peter Martyr, and other champions of Protestantism. These the Duke of Somerset, guardian to Edward VI. had invited over—to establish amongst us the doctrine of Zuinglius. But Bucer and Okinus, who preached Zuinglianism in public, in their private conversation and more familiar intercourse with friends—adopted Arianism. Some of their disciples, more zealous than their masters, or less discreet, publicly maintained their errors, and were condemned to the stake by the very leading characters of the reformation in this land.

After the demise of Edward VI. queen Mary issued an order to compel all foreigners to leave the kingdom. More than thirty thousand strangers, infected with a variety of different heresies, embarked on this occasion; but they left behind the germs of heterodoxy, and the leaven of Arianism. Every interest, not to say—the vices and the passions of men, were now divided exclusively between the catholic and the protestant cause: the Arians were comparatively neglected. Protestants alone engrossed, henceforward, nearly the whole of Mary's attention; and Cranmer, archbishop of Canterbury, who had caused the Arians to be burnt at Smithfield, was in his turn himself devoted to the faggot.

Elizabeth exchanged the old religion for Protestantism; but, apprehending for the public tranquillity, she caused the Anabaptists, the Arians, and enthusiasts to be expelled the nation.

James I. who affected theological fame, took up his pen against these sects; and all those whom his reasoning did not convince, however dignified by birth or meritorious services, he meekly consigned to the flames. This excessive rigorism gave

martyrs to the Arian cause, and multiplied the sect. (Hist. Eng; by Thoiras. Rymer's Acts, &c.)

The tumults and reverses of the civil wars which desolated England under Charles I. procured for the different sects a considerable respite. After the death of that unfortunate monarch the parliament consisted only of the house of commons, composed of a very inconsiderable number of members,—all of them Independants, Anabaptists, or other sectarians, among whom the Independants maintained the lead. The Independants wished to establish a republican government, and to make each church independent of any other, and consequently, of the church of England itself; while all should be permitted to adopt what form of church-government they deemed most convenient for themselves.

Consequently to this system of religious independence recommended in parliament, a certain person undertook to set forth a catechism which contained the Arian doctrine, and alarmed the zeal of protestants. They carried their complaints to the protector Cromwell, who, notwithstanding the resolution lately passed to tolerate all sectaries, caused the author of the catechism to be laid in irons, and suffered him to perish under the hardships of his confinement. He did not however, proceed any farther to molest the Arians, who remained in peace under Charles II. and James II. Though proscribed by the church of England as heretics, they now profess undisturbed—their heterodox opinions.

Arianism has had its champions, as well in modern as in ancient times; and many of our countrymen have displayed their controversial abilities both on the side of truth and in support of error. Each claims, exclusively, the victory: whose then is it authoritatively to decide—if this be not the privilege of the church of Christ? Private spirit, we see, is equally divided between the contending parties: either therefore, there is an authority residing in the true church paramount to all human exception, or Christ has left his church in anarchy, and the faithful to eternal wrangling—*tossed to and fro with every wind of doctrine*, and without the possibility of ever knowing whereon to rest their faith! “Independently, however, of ecclesiastic authority and the consent of all the ancient fathers professing with one accord—the consubstantiality of the Son of God,—the glory of his divinity, one would think, is clearly manifested in the divine character and spirit of his ministry. Religion, properly speaking, is nothing else but a divine light which discovers the Deity to man, and determines the obligations which we have to God. Whether the Most High reveals himself in person to mankind, or fills with his spirit extraordinary characters his representatives, he has in view the sanctification and glory of his name, and the establishment of a worship by means of which he receives

the homage due to himself alone. But if the Lord Jesus, who at the time appointed by the decrees of heaven made his appearance among mortals, was only the most dignified among creatures, and ambassador on the part of God to men, the direct tendency of his ministry, on this supposition, must have been no other, than to render mankind idolaters, and to deprive the Divinity of that glory which is exclusively His due, in order to transfer it to himself: God himself would thus become the author of men's superstition in adoring an imaginary divinity, and the spirit of Christ's ministry must prove the snare of our innocence. The first striking character of the ministry of Jesus Christ is—its having been predicted, and promised to mankind, from the beginning of the world. Scarcely had Adam fallen from the state of innocence, when God held out to him a Redeemer who was to come in after ages. In the sequel, Almighty God appears ever attentive to excite men more and more to expect his coming. The circumstances which characterised the predictions relative to him, were still more wonderful than the predictions themselves. He was foretold by a whole nation; announced to the world by a long succession of prophets; prefigured by all the ceremonies of the law; earnestly desired by all the just. He was pointed out in every age at the remotest periods of time,—not as the author of some particular event only, but in quality of the Redeemer of lost man, the legislator of innumerable people, the light of nations, the salvation of Israel. What a stumbling block must this have proved to religion in every age, if such magnificent preparatives denoted nothing more than a simple creature; and all this too, at periods when the undiscerning credulity of the multitude so easily ranked extraordinary characters in the number of its divinities? Observe how St John the Baptist, to prevent every the most distant occasion of undue veneration to his own person—in consequence of his having been but once foretold,—performs no miracle, and ceases not however, to exclaim:—I am not he whom you are to expect. Jesus, on the contrary, who had been announced by all the prophetic figures and predictions of the ancients during the lapse of four thousand years—to all the nations of the earth, comes in great virtue and power, and performs such astonishing miracles, as no mortal man had ever wrought before him. Far from cautioning the people against superstition in their too high opinion of Him, he proclaims himself aloud equal to the Almighty, and suffers them to offer him divine honors. If this then, was in fact idolatry,—in such circumstances, was it not excusable? or rather, did not God himself thus authorize the crime?—All the just of ancient times,—men so venerable for their sanctity, and illustrious for miracles, were but the shadow of the Lord Jesus: but, if we suppose Him a mere creature, where will be the striking difference between the shadow and the reality, at least in the

judgment of our senses?—To the splendor of the prophecies which announced the coming of our blessed Redeemer, we must not forget to add that of his works and wonderful actions; in which he far surpassed all former saints, who even in their miracles always exhibited marks of their dependence upon God. Jesus, on the contrary, in working the most extraordinary miracles, ordinarily acts in his own name, and—with an independence which bespeaks his own divine power: and when, for our instruction he seems to wait the concurrence of his heavenly Father, and solicits it by prayer, it is with a view only, of demonstrating more sensibly to mankind the strict union which ever subsists between the Divine Persons;—and in his office of Master and Instructor, to teach us how to act on all occasions, and to acknowledge by humble and perseverant prayer our absolute dependence upon God.

The last divine character of our Saviour's ministry shines forth—in the wonderful and unprecedented circumstances of which the whole course of his mortal life is one continued series. Conceived by the special operation of the Most High, he is born of a pure virgin; and on his first appearance among mortals, the legions of celestial spirits commence their hymns of praise and jubilee, and inform us—that this divine birth renders unto God, his proper *glory*, and the long desired *peace* to men. A new and extraordinary star (or meteor) conducts to his humble crib at Bethlehem religious princes from the remotest regions of the east—to adore him: prophecies announce his future greatness: the doctors of the law behold with astonishment his tender infancy—adorned with wisdom the most consummate,—more enlightened far, than all the experience and the learning of their ancient sages. In proportion as he advances in age, the glory of his wisdom is more and more displayed:—the great St John the Baptist proclaims himself unworthy to unloose the very latchet of his shoe:—heaven opens over his head:—the evil spirits in dismay shrink from the terror of his presence:—the heavenly Father owns him to be his well beloved Son, and proposes him to man as the living and eternal law which he commands us all to hear and to obey. If from Mount Thabor we pass to Calvary—the place where the Son of Man was to suffer infamy and torments for man's offence, even Calvary itself becomes the theatre of his glory: all nature in disorder here avows him to be its Lord, and loudly confesses his divinity. Three days after he rises from the dead,—not by the power of any other, nor again to die, as has been the case of certain other men; but by his own almighty power, and to a state of immortality. In a word, to complete his triumph over death, he ascends into heaven, borne on high—not by angels who come in crowds to meet him, and to adore in him their Sovereign Lord;—nor in a chariot of fire; but by the sole influence of his own divinity. On this occasion,

the heavenly spirits denounce to mortals his second coming, environed with the glorious appendages of immortality. And do not all these striking circumstances, concurring in the person of Jesus Christ, clearly designate the God of heaven, who after having conversed with men to withdraw them from their errors and their misery, at length bids adieu to earth and mortals again to take possession of his glory? Would not then the divine character of the ministry of Jesus tend effectually to make us all idolaters, if after all he were but a mortal man?—Nor would the spirit of his ministry, by which we understand—his doctrine, his benefits, and his promises,—less conduce to lead us into error and superstition. In the first instance, it cannot be pretended, that Jesus was not a holy and untarnished character: for where shall we find so many, and such undoubted proofs of innocence and sanctity, as in the sacred person of our Lord?—So much contempt and indifference for the things of the world;—such love of virtue;—so much zeal for the glory of God;—so much ardor for the salvation of men:—add to all this—the total exemption from those weaknesses which are almost inseparable from humanity. Now if Jesus Christ is holy, he is also God. For, whether we consider the doctrine which he delivers—with relation to his father, or with regard to men,—if he were not God, it would all be nothing but one unvaried tissue of the most malicious equivocations, or of impious implied blasphemies. If Christ be merely an ambassador from heaven, the object of his mission must be to teach the idolatrous nations the unity of the divine essence. But in the first instance, he is sent principally to the Jews; and thus his mission is superfluous, since the Jews are at the very period no longer subject to idolatry. In the second place, he does not adopt a line of conduct calculated to attain his object. Moses and the prophets, charged with the same commission, cease not to repeat that the Lord of all things is but one, without so much as insinuating the most distant comparison of themselves with the Supreme Being: Jesus, on the contrary, never ceases to declare that he is equal to the heavenly Father. He says he came down from heaven, and issued from the bosom of the Divinity; that He was before all things; that the Father and himself are one. On all occasions he compares himself with the sovereign Lord of all things. The Jews loudly murmur, and are highly scandalized at these expressions; and Jesus, far from undeceiving, confirms them in the scandal—by a language which, if it could once be supposed, that in fact he was not equal with the Heavenly Father, must of necessity imply either impiety or insanity. His followers are by himself encouraged to offer him divine honors. If then—after all—he be no more than man, or a mere creature, he came upon earth only to scandalize the Jews, by giving them reason to believe that he compared him-

self with the Most High;—he came to seduce all nations, in causing them to adore him after death;—and to spread fresh darkness, and disseminate new errors over the whole universe!

Let us now consider for a moment, the doctrine of Jesus Christ relative to men; for it equally implies the truth of his divine origin. In the first place, what wisdom, what sanctity, what sublimity, does it not display! Every article of this doctrine consists with reason, and with the soundest maxims of philosophy: every thing is here proportioned both to the wretchedness, and to the dignity of man. Observe in the second place, the duties of love and of absolute dependence which his doctrine exacts of mankind in his own regard. He commands us to love him; to place in him our only happiness; to consecrate to him all our actions, together with our whole being, in the same manner precisely, as he enjoins all these duties to be observed with reference to his Heavenly Father. Wherefore, if he is not God, his doctrine—a doctrine so much admired by the heathen sages, and which evidently bears the impress of the divinity, must henceforward be esteemed no better than a horrible compound of impiety, of pride and extreme folly; since being but a mere man, as self opinionated sectaries wish to persuade us, he studies, notwithstanding, to usurp in our hearts that throne which, exclusively, belongs to God. At such a consequence, even the Arian and the Socinian would recoil with horror. For the credit then of their consistency, let them with the orthodox believer acknowledge the divinity and the consubstantiality of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; although it is a mystery exalted infinitely above human comprehension. (Massil. Sermon on the Divinity of Christ.) See AN-TITRINITARIANS.

ARMENIANS—a branch of Eutychians or Monophusites who rejected the council of Chalcedon, and joined the Jacobites about the middle of the sixth century.

The christian religion had been planted in Armenia before the reign of Constantine, by Gregory surnamed the Illuminator; and continued in its purity till the days of the patriarch Narses, who at the period above mentioned, in a council of ten bishops, adopted the Eutychian heresy,—perhaps more with a view to ingratiate himself with the Persians; whose interest it was to sow the seeds of division between the Romans and Armenians,—than through any partiality to the doctrine itself. (Asseman. Bib. Orient. t. 3. Oriens Christianus, t. 1.) Thus commenced a schism which continued under the seven succeeding patriarchs one hundred and twelve years. After the defeat of the Persians by the emperor Heraclius, the Armenians who had suffered much under their tyrannical government, seemed disposed to return to the communion of the catholic church. A council was accordingly convened, in which what Narses had done was dis-

avowed and declared of no effect: and the people were re-admitted into the pale of the church. This reunion lasted something longer than one hundred years, when the schism was renewed at the commencement of the eighth century, by the intriguing and ambitious patriarch John Agnensis, at the requisition of the Saracen calif Omar. In a synod composed of a few Armenian, and six Assyrian bishops, he caused a definition to be signed, importing that in Jesus Christ there was only one nature, one will and operation. Thus, to Monophysism they added the equally erroneous doctrine of Monothelism; and in the same council it was ordained, that henceforward no water should be used in the sacred mysteries, for fear of insinuating two natures in Jesus Christ by the accustomed mixture of water with the wine.

The schism thus renewed—subsisted till the close of the ninth century; though some of the patriarchs had attempted a reunion, and suffered banishment in the cause. At length, after various unsuccessful endeavours to effect a reconciliation, a council was convoked at the beginning of the fourteenth century, and decreed that the Son of God was endowed with two natures and two distinct wills, the Divine and human. At this council were present twenty-six bishops, ten doctors of theology, and seven abbots. The schismatics protested against the synodical decrees; and king Hayton and Leo his son, who wished to facilitate the reunion, were assassinated. Another synod was ordered to convene, by which all that the preceding council had ordained was sanctioned and confirmed. The Monophusites, notwithstanding, remained obstinate, and took every occasion to insult the catholics, and in many instances to persecute them.

Some years after the convention of this synod, Oscin II. died, and the schismatics again took the lead. Since this period several patriarchs have signified their desire of a reunion with the Roman catholic church, but were never able to induce the nation to second so laudable a project. Many schismatics, however, have been converted by the missionaries; who still zealously and with considerable success contribute their labor towards effecting a union of the Armenian people with the catholic church. (See *Le P. Lequien, Oriens Christianus.*) The Armenians at present are partly catholic and partly schismatical. The catholics are chiefly those converted by father Barthelemy sent among them with that intent by pope John XII. They inhabit a fertile canton of Armenia called Abrener. (*De la Croix, la Turquie Chretienne.*)

The schismatical Armenians reject the council of Chalcedon, and admit but one will, one operation, and one nature in Christ. If we except these errors, they agree in doctrinal articles with the church of Rome; they have the same sacraments, and differ only in ritual peculiarities. Some among them indeed, entertain

erroneous notions concerning the procession of the Holy Ghost, and the state of souls after death. Some moreover imagine, that the souls of men were all created at the beginning of the world; that all without exception, righteous and unrighteous, were by our Saviour Christ delivered out of hell; and that there is no purgatory. But these are not the errors of the Armenian church, but of individuals only; and have been introduced among them by foreigners with whom they are in commerce. Nor were they ever noticed—as undoubtedly they must have been had they then existed,—when the reunion of the Armenians with the Roman church was in contemplation. (See the Acts of the council of Armenia held in 1342, t. 7, Collect. du P. Martenne.)

Moreover, the prayers, the canticles and most ancient hymns of the Armenian church flatly contradict these errors. In their rituals and books of prayer we find established the catholic practice of praying for the dead, the invocation of saints, and veneration of their relics; in a word, the whole religious creed of the Roman church, and the epoch of each doctrinal alteration which has been introduced in the church of Armenia, is distinctly marked. Consequently the church of Rome cannot be fairly charged with the innovations with which she is reproached by protestants, since we find her doctrines professed by a church totally independent of the Roman see; nor is this conformity of doctrine the effect of commercial intercourse, as some would fain persuade the world; since it is mentioned in rituals and liturgies far more ancient than the commerce of the Armenians with the Latins.

There are, however, besides the above errors, some abuses among the Armenians, and some traces of Judaical opinions. They observe the term prescribed by the Mosaical law for purification after child-birth; they scrupulously abstain from the flesh of animals which the law declared unclean, with the exception of hog's flesh:—an exception for which they can assign no reason. Like the Jews they offer to God the sacrifice of beasts, which they immolate at the entrance of their churches by the ministry of the priests; they dip their finger on these occasions in the blood of the victim, and with it form a cross upon the doors of their houses. The priest retains one half of the victim for his own use, while those that present it for the sacrifice consume the rest. These kinds of sacrifices they offer on all their solemn festivals, in order to obtain the cure of their diseases, or some other temporal benefits. Thus the Armenians, in order at once to enjoy the several advantages of the two covenants, join the practices of the Jewish law with the profession of christianity.

ARMINIUS—was a native of Holland, born in 1560. He re-

ceived his education partly at the university of Leyden, and partly at Geneva, and was commissioned to write against the ministers of Delft, who combated the doctrine of Theodorus Beza, regarding predestination. In order to attempt their refutation with success, he applied himself diligently to examine their arguments, and eventually adopted those sentiments which he had undertaken to confute. Arminius could not comprehend—how Almighty God, according to the blasphemous assertions of Beza and John Calvin, could predestine men to sin and damnation; knowing him to be a just Judge and most tender Father. On the contrary, he maintained, it was the will of God that all mankind should renounce their sins, and persevere to the end in righteousness, after having first attained to the knowledge of the truth; although, he said, each one was left to his own free choice, without either violence or compulsion: that the doctrine of Beza and Calvin necessarily made God the author of sin, and hardened men in their evil habits, by inspiring them with the conceit of inamissible justification.

Gomar, professor of theology at Leyden, warmly espoused the predestinarian system; and the two parties filled the United States with tumult and disorder. Arminius and his followers, in common with the rest of the reformers, rejected all infallible authority, which pretended to be the depository of revealed truths, and to fix the religious creed of christians: they deemed holy scripture exclusively, the sole rule of faith, and every private individual a competent judge of the scriptural sense. Hence they fell insensibly into the errors of the Pelagians and Semi-Pelagians regarding predestination. But they did not wish to obtrude their opinions upon others: they left them the liberty too, to interpret scripture their own way, and granted a general toleration to all christian societies—to honour God in the manner which they might think prescribed by the gospel.

Under this view, it is plain, Arminianism can have no fixed symbol, no received formula of belief; excepting only what they admit as scripture, and the fundamental dogma of the reform; namely, *that each private individual is the natural judge of the sense of scripture.*

The Calvinists have written much against the Arminians, and accuse them of having fallen into the errors of Socinianism. This charge is not altogether void of foundation, whatever the Arminians may adduce to invalidate it. But their adversaries are equally exposed to the difficulties and the retorsions of the Arminians. To the Catholic alone appertains the exclusive privilege of solidly refuting the Arminian, as well as his antagonists, by shewing against both, that the church only, is competent to interpret holy scripture in the last resort, and authoritatively to define what Jesus Christ has in fact revealed. Can any remotely plausible pretext be possibly alleged—why private

individuals, rather than the church of God collectively in its pastors;—those same pastors whom Christ commands us all to hear as his own and his heavenly Father's representatives, should preside as judges in controverted articles of faith? This, however, is the bold pretension of all the separatists from catholic communion.

ARNOLD of BRESCIA—was a scholar of Peter Abelard. Returning into Italy his native country, he took there the monastic habit, and acquired a considerable reputation as a preacher. His vanity increased with his reputation, and he sought to perpetuate his fame by some extraordinary enterprise. With this view, he began to inveigh against the monastic institute, and to rail intemperately against the clergy, priests and bishops. In his sermons he affirmed, they had no right to the possession of landed property; and damned all those that were possessed of any. This doctrine was relished with avidity by the people. The clergy was alarmed; and Innocent II. expelled the author out of Italy; who upon the first news of the pontiff's death, re-entered, and recommenced his seditious harangues. He excited the populace, already predisposed, to mutiny against Eugenius III. and proposed to the Romans the re-establishing of their ancient government, which, he observed, had made their ancestors masters of the universe.

The people, seduced by the flattering prospect, insulted persons of eminence and the cardinals; and proceeded to attack and plunder their palaces. Hereupon Pope Adrian IV. excommunicated Arnold of Brescia with his adherents, and laid the people under an interdict, till they should expel this seditious monk from Rome. Arnold was obliged to leave Rome accordingly, and retired into Tuscany, where the silly populace revered him as a prophet. He was afterwards arrested, conducted back to Rome, and publicly executed—in the sight and with the approbation of those very people who, a little while before, had honoured him as something more than human.

ARNOLD of VILLENEUVE—was born about the close of the thirteenth century. He excelled in the art of chemistry, and afterwards applied himself with much industry and success to the study of philosophy and medicine, which latter art he taught and practised at Paris with extraordinary reputation. His errors do not do him much credit as a theologian. Among other doctrinal eccentricities he taught 1.—That the human nature in Jesus Christ was in all respects equal to the Divinity. 2.—That all monks would be damned. 3.—That the world would end in 1335.

Some protestants affect to number Arnold among their glorious precursors. His blunders certainly were not catholic.

Why then obstinately contest with these gentlemen the honor which they claim?

The Arnoldists became a considerable sect in Spain. This age indeed, was an epoch peculiarly prolific in sectarianism. We will instance in proof of this, the Beguardæ, the Apostolics, the Frerots, the Lollards, without noticing a numerous spawn of subordinate sects which sprang up like mushrooms from these fertile roots. One degree more of civilization and religious light would have sufficed to make all these sectaries appear ridiculous, and have consigned them to merited oblivion.

ARNOLD of PUICERDA—was a native of Catalonia, who taught—that Jesus Christ and his apostles possessed nothing either personally, or in common ;—that none that wore the habit of St Francis, would be damned ;—and that St Francis descended annually into purgatory, and thence withdrew all the patients of his order on his return to Paradise ; in a word, he fancied that the Franciscan institute would subsist to eternity. This man retracted his very whimsical conceptions before the tribunal of the inquisition ; but, relapsing into his former eccentricity, he was consigned to perpetual imprisonment.

ARTEMON—denied the divinity of Jesus Christ, and taught the same errors as did Theodotus of Byzantium. (See his article.)

ARTOTURITES—a branch of Montanists, so called from their offering bread and cheese in their religious rites : they also admitted females to the sacerdotal and episcopal functions, as Montanus had associated to his pretended ministry of Prophet Priscilla and Maximilla. Whence the Artoturites concluded, that women might be promoted to clerical orders, as well as persons of the other sex. Their master had assumed the office of reformer ; and the disciples, as became them, had inherited his spirit. Every Montanist who had wit enough to devise some new method of *honoring God*, made it an essential article of his practice, and formed a distinct sect. Thus some among them, recollecting that the first inhabitants of the world, in their sacrifices offered to Almighty God the fruits of the earth and the products of their flocks, resolved to imitate their good old ancestors by offering *bread and cheese*.

As the Montanists affected great austerity, the spirit of mortification and sorrow for having offended God, they deemed it a principal part of the ministry to excite such sentiments in the heart of christians, and thought the fair sex better qualified than men to facilitate the desired effect. “ One might behold,” says St Epiphanius, describing the peculiarities of this sect, “ a procession of seven damsels clad in white garments, with each a

burning torch in their hand, entering their churches in the capacity of prophetesses. There they commenced their lamentations; deplored the misery of man; and by their doleful cries disposed the people to a kind of penitence." (Epiph. Hær. 49. Aug. de Hær. c. 28.) See the article MONTANUS.

ASCITES—another sect of Montanists who placed near their altar a kind of foot-ball well blown up, and danced around it. This they regarded as an emblem of their being themselves replenished with the Holy Spirit, a privilege which every Montanist pretended to. See again the article MONTANUS.

ASCOPHITES—were a branch of Valentinians, who made their first appearance about the year 173. They rejected the Old Testament, denied the necessity of good works, for which they entertained a marked contempt; and pretended that nothing more was required in order to sanctification, than simply to *know* God. Out of the aversion which they had for the sacred oblations made in the true church, they deemed it meritorious to break in pieces the consecrated vessels destined for the service of the altar. (Theod. Hær. Fab. l. 10, c. 10. Ittig. Hær. sect. 2. c. 14.)

ATHEIST—one who affects to disbelieve the existence of a Divine Being, or the superintendence of a wise and all-equitable Providence, since, according to the very sensible remarks of Cicero against the Epicurean system,—a God without Providence, properly speaking, is no God at all *in regard of men*. Of this description of Atheists, the number unfortunately, is but too considerable. Holy Scripture speaks of Atheists in general as follows, (Ps. 13. al. 12.)—*The fool hath said in his heart there is no God. It is the language of men corrupted and abominable. There is not one of them that doeth what is right. Their throat is an open sepulchre; with their tongues they act deceitfully; the poison of asps is under their lips. Their mouth is full of cursing, and of bitterness; their feet are swift to shed blood. Destruction and unhappiness is in their ways; and the way of peace they have not known; there is no fear of God before their eyes.*

The word of God here informs us, that Atheism is the growth of a corrupted heart. This truth many of our modern infidels themselves have been compelled to acknowledge; and daily experience confirms it. It is what was remarked in the book of Job (c. 21) above three thousand years ago. *Depart from us, exclaim the impious Epicures of those early times, depart from us; we will not receive the knowledge of thy ways. Who is the Almighty that we should serve Him? And what doth it profit us if we pray to Him? But, behold; in a moment they shall go*

down to hell.—Their eyes shall see their own destruction; and they shall drink of the wrath of the Almighty. Such will be the disastrous result of atheistical libertinism and impiety. If then you wish to avoid so dreadful a catastrophe, withdraw yourself in time from habits of licentiousness. It is these alone that first suggest—a wish that there was no providence to punish wicked actions: it is these that seek to stifle that conviction which the wonderful works of God are calculated to impress on every rational mind, of his own existence; and treacherously insinuate to the corrupted heart, that *perhaps* there is no God at all; or at least, no future state of reward or punishment. For who can be so grossly stupid as not to recognise in the admirable order and mechanism of the universe, the hand of Him that formed it? And if it was not beneath the dignity of the Supreme Being originally to form his creatures, how should it be unworthy of Him to be their legislator, their protector, and their judge?

2. Abhor the dangerous society of all professed irreligionists. They will not fail to use every artifice to seduce you, and all the captious arguments which their malicious ingenuity can invent, or the wicked spirit that actuates them, can suggest,—in order to your utter ruin.

ATHOCIANS—sectaries of the third century, who maintained, that the soul died together with the body, and that all sins were alike. (Cent. Magd. cent. 13, c. 5.)

AUDEUS or **AUDIUS**—was a native of Mesopotamia, noted for his impetuous zeal, and the ardour of his faith. He flourished about the middle of the fourth age. Priests and even bishops he reprehended with much harshness whenever either of the parties appeared to him—to betray a love of money, or to indulge in ease. His censoriousness and excessive insolence rendered him at length insupportable to every one; and, of course, he was frequently affronted, and sometimes treated very roughly. His pride was hurt; and he withdrew himself from the communion of the church.

That audacious freedom which is exerted in attacking superiors, has something in it that appears—to undiscerning and restless spirits—noble and magnanimous. Hence it is not surprising that Audeus should have had many abettors and associates in his schism. Among others, he was joined even by a bishop, who conferred upon him episcopal consecration. Audeus now commenced author of a sect—the prominent character of which was an invincible aversion for every thing that looked like condescension, which they branded with the odious name of *human respect*. This was their motive for keeping Easter with the Jews; pretending that the council of Nice had altered the ancient practice of the church out of complaisance to Con-

stantine, whom they wished to flatter by causing the great solemnity of Easter to coincide with the anniversary day of his birth. (Eph. Hær. 70. Theodoret. Hær. Fab. l. 4, c. 10.)

As Audeus drew after him a multitude of the common people, the catholic bishops informed the emperor; who banished him into Scythia. From the place of his exile he penetrated into the territories of the Goths, and there established some monasteries, the practice of virginity, and the rules of a solitary life; which continued among them till, in the year 372, all descriptions of christians were expelled out of Gothia by the persecution of Athanaric. Audeus, as St Epiphanius seems to insinuate, did not survive till this period. His sect was governed after his decease by divers bishops of his own creation; but these also dying off, the Audians found themselves reduced to inconsiderable numbers before the year 380. They lived in monasteries, or in country huts in the neighbourhood of some town; had no intercourse of any kind with catholics, because, in their estimation, all catholics were either themselves vicious, or at least communicated with the vicious; and would not so much as speak to a catholic, however virtuous and saintly his demeanour. They even exchanged the name of christian for that of Audian, as Epiphanius and Theodoret assure us.

Audeus, it would seem, at the commencement of his schism, had not fallen into any error against faith, since he no where is reproached for heterodox opinions. The Audians, however, afterwards attributed to the Deity a human form. (See Theodoret, Hær. Fab. l. 4, c. 9.) They also adopted some of the tenets of the Manichees; holding with them, for instance,—that God did not create the elementary fire, nor water; but that they existed independently of any first cause, and were eternal. It appears also, that these sectaries degenerated from their original austerity, and that they insensibly fell into scandalous immoralities. (Theod. *ibid.*)

B

BACULARIANS—were a sect of Anabaptists formed about the year 1528, and thus denominated, because, to the usual tenets of Anabaptism, they joined that of reputing it a crime to have any other weapon than a staff, or to repel force with force; for, said they, Jesus Christ commands his followers meekly to present their cheek to those that strike them. The love of peace which Christ came to establish upon earth, ought, according to this pacific sect, to extinguish discord, and to put an end to all

litigation. In fact, they deemed it inconsistent with the spirit of christianity to enter into any legal process.

Thus, in Germany, were found Anabaptists who quietly suffered themselves to be despoiled of their possessions, and even of life too, without resistance, while their brother Anabaptists esteemed it a divine thing violently to dispossess of their property all those that did not think as they did, and with fire and sword to spread desolation wherever people might not be disposed to embrace their doctrine. Such were the effects of the reforming principles. With what propriety then, can the pretended reformation be held up to the world as a work of light—necessary for the discernment of the truth. If that truth, in the Roman church, lay involved in a cloud of darkness, what must we think of the private spirit of its adversaries, which could adopt in practice systems of religion diametrically opposite? Is not this the spirit of confusion, and the very essence of religious absurdity?

BAIUS or BAY—was a native of the county of Haynault, taught philosophy at Louvain, and proceeded doctor in 1550. The year following, he was appointed to deliver lectures upon holy scripture. Baius now formed the project of confining the study of theology principally to holy writ, and to the thorough knowledge of the ancient fathers, for whom innnovators seemed still to entertain some sentiments of veneration; and resolved to adopt their method in handling points of controversy, in lieu of that of the schools for which protestants had no great relish. With this view, he studied with intense application the writings of St Augustine, and took him for his model; esteeming this father of all others the most accurately luminous, on the subjects which he had treated. From the works of this enlightened father and doctor of the church concerning grace, Baius wished to collect materials for his new system of free-will—against the ancient Stoics, the Manichees, and the reformers of modern times; Luther, Calvin, &c. His system was as follows:—

God, according to Baius, in creating man, acted with perfect liberty. Man himself he created a free agent; and Adam sinned by an act of his own free-will: consequently, he was not impelled by any law of destiny, as the ancient Stoics maintained.

Our first parent was originally in a state of justice, and of innocence adorned with every virtue: consequently human nature in its origin was not depraved, as was asserted by the Manichees.

Adam, by his sin, lost that absolute control which he previously had over his senses; and he forfeited the grace which was necessary in order to his perseverance in righteousness. Therefore God was not the author of the sins of men, accord-

ing to the impious assertion of Luther and Calvin; but man himself, said Baius, by placing his affections upon the creature, and this through his own evil propensity and inclination. In this consisted the liberty of man, according to Baius,—that he was not influenced by any foreign cause; his will was not *compelled*; he sinned because he acted *voluntarily*; he obeyed his own passion and not any foreign agent. This, in Baius's ideas, was all that was required to constitute free will. Besides, he observed, in things regarding the present life, man in every sense of the word, was free to choose and determine for himself. Freewill, therefore, he concluded, is not extinct. (Lib. Arbitr. c. 11.)

Baius, it is true, acknowledges that catholic divines who before him had undertaken to refute heresy, had thought differently concerning freewill, and made it to consist in the power of doing or of not doing any thing, at discretion; that is,—in an exemption from all *necessity* whatever. But he imagined they had not in strictness adhered to the sentiments of St Augustine, who, he was pleased to say, placed freewill in an exemption only, from all *exterior* necessity,—without insisting on the power of not doing what it actually does perform, or of doing what it does not actually do. (Ibid. c. 8.)

Such was the doctrine which Baius and Hessels taught at Louvain respecting grace—and the privileges of man. It was adopted by many theologians, but censured by the Popes Pius V. and Gregory XIII. also by the faculty of theology at Paris, and by other catholic universities. Baius and the Louvain doctors acknowledged they were wrong, and subscribed the condemnation of their errors as required in the papal bulls; and thus tranquillity was gradually restored between the contending parties.

Baius and Hessels, or their friends, maintained some other opinions not according with the sentiments of theologians in general—regarding the merit of good works, the conception of the blessed Virgin, and other points which it seems unimportant here to notice.

But although the faculty of Louvain seemed now completely tranquillized, disputes were again renewed with warmth—on occasion of the doctrine of Lessius and Hemelius, both of the society of St Ignatius, concerning grace and predestination. Nothing could be more diametrically opposed to the tenets of Baianism, than were the principles of Lessius. This divine contended, that after the fall of Adam, Almighty God bestowed on all men sufficient means of preservation against sin, and abundant succours to obtain eternal life; that Holy Scripture was full of precepts and exhortations to induce sinners to repentance: whence Lessius inferred that God, who never commands impossibilities, gave them sufficient graces for their conversion.

In his opinion, St Augustine did not seem to have explained the meaning of the apostle in those words to Timothy—*God willeth that all men may be saved*—when he said St Paul meant only,—that God actually did save all those that are saved. Lessius moreover taught,—that all those passages in Holy Scripture, which assert that it is *impossible* for certain persons to repent in order to their amendment, signify only—*extremely difficult* : and he maintained, that the person who is invincibly ignorant regarding faith, is bound to observe the precepts of natural religion, that is—the ten commandments ; and has it in his power so to do : unless we are prepared to say with sectaries, that free-will unto good is now extinct. He held also, that predestination to eternal life was the effect of merit foreseen ; and laid no great stress upon St Augustine's thinking otherwise. Other opinions relative to Holy Scripture Lessius taught—in opposition to the Louvain doctors ; but, as irrelevant to the errors of Baianism, we will not enter into discussion regarding them.

In the university of Louvain, the name of Augustine was revered. Hence it is not surprising, if what appeared to the faculty in the least to derogate from the authority of that father, was enough to spread alarm. It censured, accordingly, thirty propositions extracted from the works of Lessius ; and the censure was notified in form to all the churches in the Low Countries. The pope's nuncio interfered, and imposed silence on the parties ; allowing Lessius to teach a doctrine which the Roman church, the mistress of all other churches, had not condemned,—provided no imputation was thrown on those of a different opinion ; and granting a like privilege in favor of the Louvain doctors. The compromise was mutually accepted ; but other contestations succeeded—between the Society and the Dominicans in Spain, in which Molina and his antagonists displayed their syllogistic skill to great advantage. Nor had the controversy respecting grace and predestination at Louvain quite subsided. The friends of Baius now pretended, that the censured propositions, if taken in a certain acceptation, contained the doctrine of St Augustine. On the other hand, Lessius and his followers insisted, that their sentiments were not in opposition to that father ; while Janson and his disciple Jansenius combated the principles of Lessius, by the sole authority of St Augustine as understood by themselves. Jansenius read profoundly all his voluminous works no less than ten times over, and those against the Pelagians thirty times. The result of his researches was, that he persuaded himself St Augustine thought as he did. Lessius and Molina, he contended, were attempting to renew the principles of Pelagianism.

Jansenius's famous work did not appear in print till after his decease, in 1640. Refutations and apologies were undertaken en routine by the most celebrated writers of the age. Urban

VIII. after having carefully examined the book, censured it as containing some of the propositions of Baius which had been condemned by Pius V. and Gregory XIII. In the year 1650 five propositions—extracted from the work of Jansenius, were sent to Rome, with a request to the pope in the name of several prelates of the church, solemnly to condemn them. The obnoxious propositions are those which follow:—

1. Some of the Divine commandments are impossible to the faithful, according to their present circumstances; although they wish and endeavour to observe them: they are left destitute of that grace by which they are rendered possible.

2. In the state of corrupt nature, no one ever resists interior grace.

3. In order to merit or demerit in the state of corrupt nature, the liberty which excludes necessity is not requisite in man; but it suffices to have the liberty which excludes compulsion.

4. The Semi-Pelagians admitted the necessity of preventing interior grace for every individual action, even the first beginnings of faith; and they were heretics in pretending, that this grace was of such a nature, that the will had the power of resisting or consenting.

5. It is an error of the Semi-Pelagians to say—that Jesus Christ died and shed his blood for all men.

The first proposition is declared in the papal bull of Innocent X.—rash, impious, blasphemous, deserving of anathema, and heretical; the second, heretical; the third, also heretical; the fourth, false and heretical; the fifth, false, rash, scandalous; and, in case it be understood in the sense that Jesus Christ died only for the predestinate, the pope condemns it as impious, blasphemous, injurious, derogatory from the divine mercy, and heretical.

As the defenders of Jansenius did not pretend to excuse the propositions taken in their worst sense, but maintained, that this was not the sense of Jansenius; Pope Innocent, in a brief dated September 29, 1654, declared that he had condemned the doctrine contained in Jansenius's book. This explanation, though sufficiently explicit, did not satisfy the Jansenists; and Alexander VII. confirmed, by another brief, the bull of Innocent X. stating expressly, that the propositions had been condemned *in the sense of Jansenius*; and, upon the pressing application of the king of France, the same pope published a bull, dated February 15, 1665, in which was inserted a formula of abjuration upon oath—of the proscribed propositions;—enjoining all bishops to cause it to be signed. Some wished to decline it, and to observe only what they termed a respectful silence in reference to the formula, till Clement XI. finally decreed in his constitution of 1763, that this kind of respectful silence did not yield

due obedience to the decisions of the sovereign pontiffs—upon the business in question.

The clergy assembled at Paris in 1705, approved and accepted this pontifical constitution; which gave a death-blow to the advocates of Jansenism, after it had filled the most flourishing part of the Gallican and Belgian churches with religious tumult and insubordination.

BAPTISTS or ANABAPTISTS—See that article.

BARDESANÈS—a native of Syria, and one of the most illustrious champions of the christian faith—flourished under Marcus Aurelius who conquered Mesopotamia in 166. As this prince was an enemy to christianity, Apollonius his favourite wished to signalize his zeal by compelling Bardesanes to renounce his faith. But Bardesanes resolutely answered, that he feared not death; and that he could not hope to escape it, even though he should be willing to comply with what the emperor demanded.

This man—so enlightened and so virtuous—by a frailty incident to human nature, fell into the not less impious than absurd doctrine of the Valentinians; and with those infidels admitted a strange and fanciful generation of Eons; (See VALENTINUS) and denied the resurrection of the body. He did not, it is true, persist in the errors of that sect; but he adopted others. Like all the philosophers and theologians of his time, he wished to dive into the origin of evil, and to account for its existence in the universe. He saw the absurdity of making God the author of evil, and concluded that it had some other cause distinct from God: this cause, according to Bardesanes, of course was Satan or the Devil, whom he conceived to be the enemy of God, but not originally his creature. He held, therefore, an evil principle, endowed with self-existence; and distinct from the Supreme Being whom he acknowledged to be but one; not perceiving that self-existence necessarily included every other divine perfection.

Bardesanes's new system ascribed to Satan that department only, in the government of the universe, which appeared to him essentially requisite—in order to explain the origin of evil. Thus, said he, Almighty God created the universe and man: but the man which he formed at the beginning, was not man environed with the flesh; but the human soul united to a body endowed with subtilty, and of a substance resembling its own nature. This was the soul which God had created *according to his own image and likeness*, and which, surprised by the artifices of Satan, had been persuaded to transgress the divine law. In punishment of her crime, she was banished Paradise, and tied down to a carnal body, now become her prison.

As this was the effect of sin, Bardesanes concluded, 1st.—That Jesus Christ had not assumed a human body; 2nd.—That we shall not rise again with our earthly body, but with a celestial body, which is to be the residence of an innocent and pure soul. (Orig. cont. Marcion. Dial.)

He acknowledged the immortality of the soul, and the liberty, the omnipotence and providence of God. (Euseb. de Præp. Evang. l. 1, c. 10.) He had combated fatalism in an excellent work of which Eusebius has preserved us a considerable fragment. But although he believed the *soul* of man exempt from the laws of destiny, he thought that, with regard to the *body*, every thing was ruled by fate. (Epiph. Hær. 36. Photius Bib. Cod. 123. Euseb. Hist. Eccles. l. 4.)

BASILIDIANS—the followers of Basilides, an Egyptian philosopher who flourished about the commencement of the second century. The origin of the world and its co-existing evils—was at this time a principle object of philosophic research. Basilides regarded this second question as one the most interesting to human curiosity, and sought with much eagerness its solution in the books of the philosophers, the writings of Simon Magus and his disciple Menander, and even in the doctrines of christianity itself. His faith, however, was but superficial; and his curiosity not yet sated. He formed to himself a system made up of the principles of Pythagoras, those of Simon Magus, the dogmas of christianity, and the tenets of Judaism. (Clem. Alex. l. 4. Strom.)

Basilides supposed that the universe was not created immediately by the Supreme Being, but by certain intellectual agents his creatures. This was the fashionable theorism of the day, and was almost general among the various sects which affected to descant upon the origin of the world, and its concomitant evils. According to Basilides the Supreme Being begot Understanding: Understanding produced the Word: the Word produced Prudence: Prudence generated Wisdom and Power: Wisdom and Power—the Virtues, the Principalities and the Angels: the Angels were of various orders; the first of which produced the first Heaven and so on, to the amount of three hundred and sixty-five. (See SIMON MAGUS, and SATURNINUS.) Those angels which occupy the lowest of the heavens, created this world; and of course it is no matter of surprise, that there should therein exist a mixture of good and evil. The empire of the universe they divided among themselves; and the chief angel of the heaven in which our earth is situated, had the Jewish nation for his inheritance; which accounts for the many prodigies operated in their favor. This ambitious angel wished to subject all the tribes of the earth to his Jews. Upon this the other angels entered into a league against him, and all nations became

enemies to the Jewish race. From that instant man was unhappy, groaning under the tyranny of the ambitious angels. The Supreme Being compassionating human wretchedness, sent down his first-born son Intelligence, or Jesus the Christ, to deliver those that should believe in him.

Basilides acknowledged the miracles which the christians ascribed to our blessed Redeemer. Nevertheless he denied the incarnation, and maintained that Jesus Christ had assumed only the appearance of man; that in his passion he had exchanged figures with Simon of Cyrenè, and that thus the Jews had crucified Simon instead of Christ, who attended as spectator, and derided their infuriated malice in a form invisible to them; and then ascended into heaven to his Father. Basilides did not conceive it incumbent on any one to die for Christ. On the contrary, he affirmed that the martyrs suffered death for Simon of Cyrené, not for Jesus who did not die at all. (Iren. l. 1, c. 32.)

With a variety of other ridiculous errors, Basilides imagined that each individual had two souls; in order, with the Pythagoreans, to explain more easily the struggles of reason and the passions. (Clem. Alex. l. 2, Strom.) He was a great proficient in the black art, and had his head brim-full of the reveries of Cabalism. He fancied that, because the sun performed his annual revolution, according to the ideas of former times, in 365 days, this number must be peculiarly agreeable to the Supreme Being; and expressed it by these letters of the alphabet in the word *Abraxas*, to which he attached the privilege of drawing down the favours of heaven upon those that used it. Hence it was engraved upon stones, which, from the letters inscribed, were called *Abraxas*; and of which the different cabinets of Europe contain a prodigious number. Magic characters and superstition were then in general use; and the *Abraxas* were quickly propagated in all directions. It became usual to engrave upon them the symbols expressive of their supposed virtues, and the favours expected to be obtained. (Montfaucon, Antiq. expliq. T. 2, l. 3.)

Those ignorant and superstitious christians who had adopted the principles of Pythagoras, imagined that Jesus Christ resided in the sun, and that the *Abraxas* had the virtue of attracting his graces upon those that wore them; and, in order to distinguish themselves from the Basilidians and other Cabalists, they caused his image to be engraved upon their *Abraxas*. In fact, numbers of ill-instructed christians confided much in Talismans; and even in St Chrysostom's time, some wore medals of Alexander the Great, ascribing to them the virtue of preserving his infatuated clients. (Chrys. Catech. 2.)

The Basilidians propagated their sect in Spain and in the Gauls. Stupidity and superstition embraced their phantastic system; and even learned men have put their ingenuity on the

rack to discover the mysteries of christianity in their unintelligible symbols. (See Basnage, Hist. des Juifs, T. 2, l. 3. Montfaucon Ant. Expl. t. 2.)

BEGHARDÆ or BEGUARDÆ—false devotees, who appeared in Germany at the commencement of the fourteenth age. A love of singularity, and, perhaps at first, a desire of rivalling the virtue of the mendicant and other religious orders lately established in the church, collected together, and united in particular societies—crowds of these wandering devotees in the different resorts where they happened to assemble. Societies of this description were formed in Germany, in France and Italy, where they were known by the name of Beguards, of Frerots, of Fratricelli, of Dulcinists, Apostolics, &c. These sects had each their private conventicles, without any common head; only the Frerots and the Dulcinists had their leaders apart. The Beguards were a disorderly assemblage of men and women, who pretended to lead a life of greater perfection than other christians.

According to these sectaries, there was a certain degree of perfection to which every christian ought to aspire, and beyond which no man could advance; otherwise, they pretended, some might attain to a higher state of perfection, than our Saviour Jesus Christ. But when once a person is actually arrived at the desired term, he has no farther need of grace, of exercises of virtue, or of prayer. He is incapable of sin, and henceforward even in this life enjoys all possible beatitude.

On their way to this state of impeccability, and even after its supposed attainment, they professed a more than ordinary tenderness for each other, and soon perceived they were not yet exempt from the tyranny of the passions. They found it convenient too, to satisfy these passions, and hit upon a witty expedient to do away the crime. The act of fornication these hypocritical pretenders to perfection reckoned no sin, because, like our modern grand reformer Martin Luther—in defiance of the divine prohibition, they deemed it an act of *necessity*, especially under temptation; but to kiss a person was highly criminal.

Their errors were condemned in a council held at Vienne under Clement V. in the year 1311; they were classed as follows:—

1st. Man may attain even in this life a degree of perfection which will render him incapable of sin, or of increasing in grace.

2nd. Those who are arrived at this perfection, ought neither to fast nor pray; because in this state the senses are so completely subject to the spirit and to reason, that a person may freely indulge his body whatsoever it craves.

3rd. Those that have attained this state of liberty, are no longer subject to the commands of superiors, nor bound to comply with the precepts of the church.

4th. Man may arrive at final beatitude in this life.

5th. The practice of virtues obliges only the imperfect; but the perfect soul may dispense with them at will.

6th. Simply to kiss a woman is a mortal sin; but a carnal act with her is not so:—With other absurdities of no better tendency. (Dupin, 14 siecle, p. 566. D'Argentré, Collect. Jud. T. 1, p. 276. Natal. Alex. in sæc. 14.)

The condemnation of these fanatics did not extinguish the sect. It was perpetuated at Spire by one Berthold; also in other parts of Germany. A part of their errors was adopted by the Frerots and the Dulcinists; or rather, they fell into them by the natural tendency which these kind of sects in general have towards immorality. The Frerots held other eccentric doctrines peculiar to themselves. See the article FRATRICELLI.

BERENGER or BERENGARIUS—was born at Tours towards the close of the tenth century. After passing through a course of studies, he was appointed teacher in the public schools of St Martin, and was made treasurer of the church of Tours, and, progressively, archdeacon of Angers;—without quitting, however, his former professorship at Tours. He attacked the doctrine of transubstantiation, and maintained, that in the eucharist the bread and wine were not changed into the body and blood of Jesus Christ; although he acknowledged—with Martin Luther after him, that both scripture and tradition expressly taught that the eucharist contained, verily and in reality, the body and blood of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; and that it was truly his body: but he held with the same Luther in later times, that the Word united himself to the bread and wine, and that by this *union* they became the body and blood of Christ, without any change of their nature or their physical essence, and without ceasing still to be bread and wine.

This strange doctrine Berenger delivered in his school at Tours; and all were shocked at the innovation. A letter which he wrote to the famous Lanfranc in defence of his opinion, was sent to Rome, and read in a council assembled by Pope Leo IX. in 1050. The council condemned his doctrine, and excommunicated his person. Berenger withdrew to the abbey of Preaux, and attempted to engage William Duke of Normandy to espouse his cause. But that prince ordered the bishops of the province to convene a synod; in which Berenger was again condemned. In several other councils he retracted his errors, and as often repented of his recantations; till Gregory VII. held another synod at Rome, in 1079, when Berenger once for all

abjured his novel opinions. The pope treated him with great lenity and kindness; and he died in retirement not far from Tours, in 1088.

Messrs Claude, La Roque and Basnage, with other protestant authors, insist much upon the multitudes that followed Berengarius's system. On the contrary, Guimond, a contemporary historian and archbishop of Aversa, testifies expressly, that Berengarius never had one single borough on his side, and that he was patronised by none but the ignorant. All historical monuments of the times which have been handed down to us, attest the same. Nor ought the contrary assertion of William of Malmesbury, who lived only in the year 1242; or of Matthew of Westminster, who flourished so late as the fourteenth century, to have any weight with persons of sound judgment. Their testimony comes too late: some Manichees, it is true, who reappeared in France in the fourteenth century, denied with Berengarius, the dogma of transubstantiation. But this pretended perpetuity of the Berengarian doctrine which Basnage strains every nerve to render plausible, and endeavours to deduce from the ninth age down to the reformation, is not that perpetuity of faith which characterises the church of Christ, and is the exclusive mark of truth. There is not, perhaps, a single heresy which, by dint of sophisms and far fetched inductions, may not trace a long succession of its sectaries from its very birth, full as well as the reformation. Has not Sandius, for instance, discovered a regular succession of *Arians* in every epoch of christianity? (Sand. Hist. Eccles.)

The perpetuity to which the catholic church lays claim, is of a nature widely different. It requires essentially two conditions.

1. That no period can be assigned in which the controverted article was unknown in the church, as was the error of Berengarius, who when it was objected that the universal church taught otherwise, replied that the church itself had perished. (Vide Lanfranc, c. 23.)

2. It must be *universal*. For the true church being a visible society, and essentially *catholic*; that is, a religious society the most diffusively extended;—a few obscure sectaries who teach and propagate their errors in secret, and are condemned by the whole church;—who have neither ministry, nor jurisdiction, nor authority,—cannot in any sense be said to represent the church of Christ.

The Berengarians did not adhere invariably to Berengarius's system. All indeed, maintained that the bread and wine were not converted into the body and blood of Christ: but some of them could not conceive—how the Word should unite himself to the bread and wine in the eucharist; and concluded, that in fact, the sacrament under both species, was not the body and blood of Jesus Christ, but only called so metaphorically, because

it represented the body and blood of our blessed Redeemer. Thus Berengarius and his followers alike denied the mystery of transubstantiation ; but while the master held that the consecrated bread became the body of Christ, the disciples believed it to be no more than the figure. The latter sentiment was adopted by the greater part of the sectaries who made their appearance after Berengarius, and who added this error to other ancient heresies. Of this description were—Peter de Bruys, Henry of Toulouse, Arnold of Brescia, the Albigenes, Amauri of Chartres, and—long after these, Wicklef, the Lollards, the Thaborists. Last of all, Carlostadius, Zuinglius and Calvin renewed the errors of the Berengarians ; while Luther embraced the doctrine of Berengarius himself, and maintained *impanation* with great energy against the Sacramentarians. We will now beg leave to enter a little more at large into the merits of the cause ; and hope to demonstrate to the full satisfaction of every unprejudiced mind not only the *possibility* of the real presence in the sacrament, but the *truth* of the catholic doctrine regarding it,—from scripture, from the unanimous authority of the fathers in every age, and from a principle of the soundest philosophy. But as the grand and indeed, the only plausible objection of protestants, originates in the supposed *impossibility* of the thing, it will not, it is hoped, be deemed preposterous, if *here* we begin our enquiry, and make it the first point of disquisition.

A body, it is objected, cannot exist in many places at the same time.

Were this an axiom self-evident and universal, applying even to Almighty Power, the Lutheran and the Catholic doctrine of the real presence must alike fall to the ground. But, are protestants in this country better acquainted with the essential properties of bodies, than all the most sagacious philosophers that ever have existed ? These have not dared positively to assert, that either extension or impenetrability form part of the essence of a natural body ; much less have they pretended to define or circumscribe the properties of a body supernatural. And if we do not know, as most certainly we do not,—with what extraordinary endowments our own bodies shall be gifted at the general resurrection, when, according to the doctrine of St Paul, they shall rise spiritual bodies ; who will have the temerity to limit the perfections of the glorified humanity of Jesus Christ ? Protestants will readily admit that a spirit, although this too, is equally incomprehensible, may be really and substantially in all places at the same instant. For God is a spirit, and He is everywhere. Why then pertinaciously contend, that Omnipotence itself cannot communicate that degree of spirituality to the transcendently glorious body of Christ, necessary to its existence in more than one place at the same time ? In effect, a body in motion really does exist in many places during a given period : a body which with one

degree of velocity, moves forward at the rate of one foot each second, in sixty seconds will be in every part of the space contained within sixty different feet. But if, instead of one degree of velocity we supposed it to have sixty, it would run the space of sixty feet each second; consequently, would be in so many different places in that second: and so, in progression, if we supposed its velocity to be infinite, there would be no single instant of time in which this body would not exist in many places; and it would run any given space in the smallest duration imaginable. Now the smallest imaginable duration is in regard of us an indivisible point; and a body moving with infinite rapidity may thus—by the Divine Power—be every instant in many distant places, really present to them all each moment: and this, we conceive, might answer every purpose of our blessed Saviour's miraculous communication of himself to men in the most holy sacrament. Nor will this explanation be invalidated by observing, that the very first law of motion would be inverted in the realization of such a system. Motion itself, and its primary laws, depend on God; and it is equally easy for Him to cause a body to move in direct opposition to all its known laws, as to observe the ordinary normas.

As to what remains, we pretend not to fathom the depth of the divine wisdom, or to reveal his *unsearchable ways*; but only to make it obvious to all, that the mystery of the Real Presence is not repugnant to reason, nor contrary to the principles of sound philosophy. And this alone should abundantly suffice to do away the difficulties of protestants. For *catholics*—it is enough to know that it is the doctrine of truth, and that the reason of a true believer is—faith.

The testimony of the senses against transubstantiation is an objection by no means so difficult. Our perceptions of a body we receive, only from the impressions excited in our soul. These impressions may be excited independently of the body, and by an immediate operation of the divinity on our souls: consequently, there subsists not any necessary connection between the testimony of the senses, and the existence of the objects which they represent. The certitude, therefore, of this testimony depends on the certitude which we have, that God does not excite, nor permit spirits of a higher order to excite in our soul, the impressions apt to be referred exclusively to bodies. Thus it is doubtless *possible*, that God may cause in our soul the impressions which we ascribe to bread and wine, although in effect there be neither the one nor the other. Nor is this supposition inconsistent with the maxim, that the testimony of our senses is, in the natural course of things, infallible, as long as we maintain (and catholics certainly do maintain in the present case) that God has admonished us not to give credit to our senses in this instance. Has he not, in effect, sufficiently fore-

warned us not to lay too great a stress upon the testimony of the senses in the mystery of the blessed eucharist, by declaring beforehand that here the bread and wine is converted into the body and blood of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ? What protestant will deny that angels have appeared in the shape of men, (Gen. xix. Matth. xxviii. Mark xvi. &c.) and the Holy Ghost in the shape of a dove? (Luke iii. 22, &c.) Neither can the senses, properly speaking, be said, even on this occasion, to be deceived; because they truly represent what is truly here; namely the colour, shape, taste and other properties of bread and wine. The judgment indeed, is deceived if, in consequence of this colour, taste and shape, it too hastily pronounces, that this is, in fact, bread and wine. In the blessed sacrament, we may at all events securely depend on the sense of *hearing*; which informs us by the word of God and the authority of his church, that what *appears* to be bread and wine in the eucharist, *is in truth* the body and blood of Christ. *Faith comes by hearing*, saith St Paul, *and hearing by the word of Christ*. (Rom. x. 17.)

Another difficulty against the catholic doctrine of the real presence and transubstantiation is, to conceive—how the body and blood of Christ can be contained entire in so small a space as that which is occupied by the consecrated species; nay, even in the smallest sensible particle of them. This to human conception, doubtless, is inexplicable; but not impossible to Almighty Power, any more than for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle. *With men this is impossible*, says our blessed Redeemer, *but not with God, for with God all things are possible*. (Matth. xix. 26. Mark x. 27.)

THE REAL PRESENCE OF THE BODY AND BLOOD OF CHRIST
DEMONSTRATED FROM SCRIPTURE, AND THE UNANIMOUS TESTIMONY OF THE ANCIENT FATHERS AND DOCTORS OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

The catholic church believes, that in the eucharist after the words of consecration,—are truly, really, and substantially present the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity of Jesus Christ, under the outward forms or appearances of bread and wine; and that, by virtue of our Saviour's words pronounced by the priest at the consecration,—is effected a true and real change of one substance into another; which we term transubstantiation. On the contrary, the more modern adversaries of the catholic church, with the ancient Berengarians contend, that Christ's body and blood are not truly and really present in their own substance in the sacrament, but by faith only, and in figure; or, according to some, with Berengarius originally,—if they be there at all—they are accompanied with

the substance of bread and wine. What then did our Blessed Redeemer actually institute, and give to his apostles at the last supper? For the sacrament which the faithful receive at this day, is the same which the apostles then received, as both catholics and their adversaries allow. In the twenty-sixth chapter of St Matthew, we read thus—*Whilst they were at supper, Jesus took bread, blessed it and brake it, and gave it to his disciples, saying; this is my body: and taking the chalice he gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying; Drink ye all of this, for this is my blood of the New Testament, which shall be shed for many unto the remission of sins.* St. Mark, c. xiv. gives our Saviour's words as follows:—*This is my body; this is my blood of the New Testament, which shall be shed for many:* And St. Luke, to the like import—*This is my body which is given for you; do this for a commemoration of me: this is the chalice of the New Testament in my blood, which shall be shed for you.* (c. xxii.) St Paul, in his first epistle to the Corinthians (c. xi.) agrees in substance with the evangelists: and what can possibly be more plain, and more expressive of the real presence and transubstantiation? Certainly, had our Divine Redeemer intended to give only a mere figure, excluding the reality—of his body and blood, this manner of expressing himself would have been exceedingly obscure, or rather downright absurd, as will presently appear.

1. That the expression is very *obscure* in the protestant or figurative acceptance, is abundantly demonstrated from the effect. For every individual christian church throughout the world actually followed the contrary sense during the lapse of many ages, and constantly held that these words implied—not a *figurative*, but the *real* presence of the body and blood of Christ in this adorable sacrament. It is remarkable through the whole series of the gospels, that when our Saviour spoke in parables any thing obscure, he carefully explained his meaning to the apostles. When they were alone, *he explained all things*, says St Mark, (c. iv.) Now at the institution of the blessed sacrament every circumstance required, that he should express himself in the most intelligible terms. For—when, in fact, do all prudent persons endeavour to explain their mind in the clearest manner possible, if not—while they are issuing commands of the utmost importance—while they are treating with, and taking leave of their nearest and dearest friends; and above all,—while they are devising their last will and testament? All these circumstances concur in the institution of the most blessed sacrament. On this occasion our Lord Jesus commands that *clean oblation* to be made, which the prophet Malachi foretold would be offered to God in all places; when he says—*Do this in remembrance of me*, (Luke xxii.) He institutes a sacrament, the use of which is to be daily and perpetual in his church: He is taking leave of his friends;—*I will not now call you servants*, saith he, *but friends*.

(John xv.) *Friends* indeed, and confidential ministers, whom he had appointed to teach all nations his gospel and divine law. In a word, he is forming a treaty,—a covenant,—an alliance which is to endure to the end of time. Can any circumstances be conceived to exist, which require greater accuracy and perspicuity of words?

It is observable, moreover, that when our blessed Saviour designed to confer any very signal favour upon his church, he usually foretold and promised it, that it might more easily find credit when accomplished. Thus, for instance, he promised the sacrament of baptism, and the power of forgiving sins: thus he foretold his passion, his death, his resurrection: thus, in a word, he foretold and promised to his church this inestimable benefit of the holy eucharist. His words are these—in the sixth chapter of St John:—*The bread which I will give is my flesh for the life of the world. The Jews, therefore, strove amongst themselves, saying: how can this man give us his flesh to eat? Then Jesus said: verily, verily, I say unto you, unless you eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you. Whosoever eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath life everlasting, and I will raise him up at the last day; for my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed: He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood dwelleth in me and I in him.* From those words of the Jews—How can this man give us his flesh to eat—it is evident they understood our Saviour's promise was to be fulfilled by giving them in reality his flesh and blood: and our Lord, instead of explaining, asserts in still more positive terms, that—except they eat his flesh and drink his blood, they shall not have life in them; and that his flesh is meat indeed, and his blood is drink indeed. These words were spoken in the presence of his apostles; so that when he said at his last supper—*This is my body which shall be given for you; this is my blood which shall be shed for you:* they could not reasonably understand it in any other sense, than as a realization of his promise; namely, that it was his real flesh and blood, which he had declared, both to them and to the Jews, were meat and drink in reality.

Again: would our Redeemer, who came to die for all mankind, and who commanded his followers to avoid with all possible care the least scandal; would He if he had spoken only of a *figurative* eating of his flesh and drinking of his blood, have neglected to explain himself, when he saw not only the Jews,—but even some of his disciples so far shocked at this his promise, as immediately to forsake him? How much less when he foresaw, that his whole visible church upon earth, would be involved, on this supposition, during the lapse of many ages, in so gross an error, and so serious an inconvenience? This cannot be admitted on any prudential ground whatever. In vain

would protestants allege, that it is a usual thing in scripture and common discourse, to give to the *sign* the name of the *thing signified*. For when a thing neither naturally represents another, nor is known to be used as the representation of another, it is contrary to all the laws of discourse, and highly absurd, to give it the name of what it is intended to signify, without first preparing the mind of the hearers so to understand it. This would be evidently the case in the present instance, as the fact alone of the whole church of Christ for ages being led astray by the supposed omission, plainly demonstrates.

But, may not our Saviour's words at the last supper signify, that his body and blood are given *in* and *with* the bread and wine, conformably to the opinion of Martin Luther and Berengarius? By no means; for had our blessed Lord intended to give us his body and blood *in* and *with* the bread and wine, he would assuredly, have said—*Here* is my body, *in this* is my blood, rather than—this is my body, this is my blood; which words could not be verified without a substantial change of the sacramental elements into his body and blood. When our Redeemer changed water into wine at the marriage feast of Cana, had he said—this is wine; would not these words evidently have implied a substantial change of what was in the vessels, into wine? The present case is exactly similar.

Again: it is objected that St Paul terms the sacrament after consecration *bread*, (1 Cor. xi.) and consequently excludes all idea of a change. This argument is but very weak and inconclusive. First, because the scripture sometimes calls things after their change—by the name which they had before; though it positively affirms them to have been substantially changed. Thus, though the water was changed into wine at Cana, the evangelists calls it water made wine, (John ii. 9.) Thus again, the scripture tells us (Exod. v. ii.) that Aaron's and the magicians' rods were changed into serpents: yet it calls them rods even after this change. *Aaron's ROD devoured the magician's RODS*. Frequently also, it gives a thing the name of what it resembles. For instance, angels are called men in St Mark xvi. St Luke xxiv. and in various other passages of holy writ; because they appeared under the disguise of men. It ought not therefore to seem extraordinary, if St Paul calls the sacrament bread; as it has the outward appearance of bread, and was bread in reality before the All-powerful hand of God had wrought the change.

It remains now that we briefly examine the sentiments of the primitive fathers and doctors of the church on this important subject. In the second age St Ignatius the holy bishop of Antioch, a disciple of the apostles who suffered martyrdom about the year 107, and certainly must be presumed to have understood their doctrine, in his epistle to the christians of Smyrna calls the eucharist “the flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, which suffered for

our sins, and which the father raised by his bounty." In the same age St Justin Martyr, in his apology to the heathen emperor for the christian religion, affirms, "That as our Saviour Jesus Christ was himself the Word made flesh, and took for our salvation both flesh and blood; so we are taught, that the eucharist is the flesh and blood of the same Jesus incarnate." (Apol. 2 ad Antonin.) Certainly, no man in his senses would write thus to a heathen emperor, if he understood the words of Christ only in a *figurative* sense.

In the same age, St. Ireneus, in his fifth book against Heresies, speaking of the sacramental bread and wine, says: "By the word of God, they are made the eucharist which is the body and blood of Christ." In the following age, St. Cyprian, in his sermon on the Lord's supper, says: "The bread which our Lord gave to his disciples, being changed, not in appearance, but in substance, by the omnipotency of the Word, is made flesh." He also affirms, that in the eucharist "we eat the body of Christ, and drink his blood." (Lib. de Orat. Dom.) A little before this, the famous Origen reminds us, (Hom. 7, in Levit.) that "in the old law the manna was a figurative food; but now, the flesh of God the Son made man, is meat in reality; since he himself cries out,—*My flesh is meat indeed.*" Tertullian, his contemporary, says: (l. 4. contr. Marcion.) "The bread which Christ took at his last supper, and distributed to his disciples, he changed into his body."

In the fourth age, after St. Basil, St. Gregory Nazianzen, St. Ephrem, and St James of Nisibis, with many other Fathers eminent for learning and holiness of life, who all agree in the same sentiments, the great St Chrysostom delivers himself in the following terms: "Let us on all occasions believe Almighty God; nor contradict Him, though what He says seem contradictory to our reason and sense. *His* words cannot deceive us; *our* senses are easily mistaken. *His* words never err; *our* senses frequently misguide us. Since, therefore, it is He who says—*This is my body*, let us rest convinced—it is so. He who did these things at his last supper, still continues to do the same: for our part, we act only as his ministers; it is He that sanctifies; it is He himself that effects the change." (Hom. 83, in Matt.) How many now exclaim;—Oh, that I could see him in his own figure, or any thing about him! Believe me, you do more than *see* his person; you eat his sacred flesh, you receive him within your bosom.—How pure ought not that tongue to be, which is purpled with his adorable blood!" (Hom. 87, p. 787. T. 7. Ed. Ben.) Can any thing be stronger, or more decisive in favour of the catholic doctrine?

St. Ambrose, another luminous doctor and father of the same age, writes thus: (lib. de his quæ mysteriis initiantur, c. ix.) "Perhaps you will say—I see quite another thing: how can

you assure me that I receive the body of Christ?" To which he answers:—"If the words of Elias were powerful enough to command fire from heaven, shall not the words of Christ be able to change the nature of the elements? You have read of the whole creation—He said and they were made, he commanded and they were created. Cannot then the word of Christ, which made out of nothing that which *was* not, change the things that *are*, into what they *were* not?"

In the same age, a little before SS Chrysostom and Ambrose, St Cyril of Jerusalem had said of the blessed eucharist: (Cat. Mys. 4.) "Do not consider it as mere bread and wine; for now it is the body and blood of Christ, according to our Lord's own words." And again: "Judge not the thing, says he, by the taste . . . knowing and holding for certain, that what we see is not bread, although it tastes like bread; but is the body of Christ." Could any catholic of the present times express his faith of transubstantiation more clearly? St Jerom, St Augustine, St Paulinus, Leo the Great, and all the fathers of the church in every succeeding century, with one accord profess the same doctrine; and where shall we find more able interpreters of the word of God, than they were? From this unanimity of the fathers in each century we may fairly collect—what was the doctrine of the church in *their* times? and the church itself decided the question in the condemnation of Berengarius, the first that openly contested it. His error was proscribed and anathematized by no less than fourteen councils in divers parts of Christendom—while he was still living. Their decisions were afterwards confirmed by the general councils of Lateran, Constance and Trent:—Not to mention the unanimous consent of the Greeks, and all the oriental christians of whatever denomination,—demonstrated in the clearest manner by the authors of the book entitled—*La Perpetuité de la Foi*,—confirmed by the authentic testimonies of their patriarchs, archbishops, bishops, abbots, &c. by the decrees of their synods against Cyril of Lucar; by the writings of their ancient and modern divines, and by all their liturgies;—and acknowledged by many protestant writers. Dr Philip Nicholai a protestant, in his first book of the *kingdom of Christ*, p. 22, writes thus: "Let my christian readers be assured, that not only the churches of the Greeks, but also the Russians, and the Georgians, and the Armenians, and the Indians, and the Ethiopians, as many of them as believe in Christ, hold the true and real presence of the body and blood of the Lord, &c." Now what can be a more convincing evidence of this doctrine having been handed down by tradition from the apostles, than to see all descriptions of christians that have any pretensions to antiquity, with one accord professing and upholding it?

BERNARD of THURINGIA—was a hermit of the tenth century. Towards the middle of this century he announced with great energy the approaching dissolution of the world. This he collected from the Apocalypse which says, that after a thousand years are elapsed the old serpent shall be let loose. This old serpent the hermit took to be antichrist. Consequently, as the term of one thousand years, mentioned in the Apocalypse, was nearly expired, his appearance could not be very distant; and, of course, the final dissolution must be at hand. To make his conceit appear more plausible, he supported it by a very singular kind of argument which, however, seemed conclusive to the majority of his audience. When the day of the annunciation of the blessed Virgin shall fall on Good Friday; know for certain, exclaims the hoary enthusiast, that the day of judgment is very near. In a word, he at length persuaded himself, and proclaimed aloud in his sermons and discourse—that God had actually revealed to him the awful circumstance. A lively picture of that dreadful day; the passage of the Apocalypse; and, above all, that effrontery with which the impostor announced his pretended revelation, alarmed the credulity of infinite numbers of all ranks of people. Even the ministers of religion gave into the general delusion, and by their sermons contributed to diffuse a universal panic. An eclipse of the sun which happened to take place, threw all into confusion. Multitudes of people fled for refuge to the rocks, and hid themselves in caverns. Nor were they altogether tranquillized by the return of light, till theologians were engaged to show, that the coming of antichrist was yet very distant. At the commencement of the eleventh century the alarm completely ceased, when people saw the world continue to subsist as in the preceding ages; and the hermit's prophecy was no longer current.

BERYLLUS, bishop of Bostra in Arabia—after having worthily governed his diocese for some years, fell into the dangerous error—that Jesus Christ had no existence before the incarnation; imagining that he became God only at his temporal birth of the Virgin Mary. He added, that our blessed Redeemer was no otherwise to be esteemed God, but only in as much as the Father dwelt within him, as formerly he abode in a special manner with the prophets. The famous Origen was sent to Bostra to undeceive him; and, having entered into conversation with him, and learnt what were his sentiments from his own mouth, happily succeeded in reclaiming him from his errors, which Beryllus without hesitation instantly renounced.

BLASTUS—was a Jew who embraced the sect of the Valentians, and to the system of Valentinus added some Jewish practices, to which he still remained attached. Such, for instance,

was the celebration of Easter on the fourteenth day of the moon. (Vide Autor. Append. apud Tert. de Præscrip. c. 53.)

BOGOMILIANS—a term signifying, in the Sclavonian tongue, *solicitors of the divine mercy*, and appropriated to certain sectaries of Bulgaria, the followers of one Basil a physician, who in the reign of Alexis Comnenus renewed the errors of the Paulicians. The inroads of barbarians, and the persecution of the Iconoclasts, had nearly extinguished learning throughout the empire of the Greeks. It had, however, begun to revive a little under Basil the Macedonian, Leo the philosopher, and his successors. But superstition and the love of the marvellous were still almost universally predominant.

In these ages of ignorance and of childish credulity, some germs of the Paulician heresy not yet extinct, began insensibly to unfold, conjointly with the errors of the Messalians. Basil made up a compound of these errors; selected twelve disciples, whom he stiled apostles; and commissioned them to propagate his doctrine; although—with the utmost caution and reserve. He was advanced in years,—of a modest countenance, and habited like a monk. The emperor Alexis Comnenus signified a wish to see him; affected a desire of becoming his disciple; and thus engaged him to reveal to him without disguise—the whole tenor of his impious doctrines. Alexis had concealed behind a curtain in the apartment where he gave him audience, one of his amanuenses; who took down in writing all that Basil said. The emperor called an assembly of the senate, the military officers, the patriarch and the clergy; and caused the paper which contained the obnoxious system, to be read in their presence. Basil did not disavow it. He offered to maintain whatever he had said, and declared his readiness to suffer the most cruel torments, and death itself,—under the delusive expectation that the angels would protect him. Every effort to undeceive him was tried in vain; and he was ultimately condemned to the stake. The emperor ratified the sentence; and, after fresh endeavours to reclaim him, an immense pile was constructed in the middle of the Hippodrome; and near to it was placed a cross. Basil had his choice; but—not less obstinately than impiously—preferred the flames.

The populace demanded aloud that all his sectarists should undergo the like chastisement. But Alexis was content to order them into custody; where some renounced their errors, while others persisted to the end incorrigible. A professor of Wirtemberg published a history of these fanatics, in the year 1711. See also Baronius, Euthymius, Anna Comnena, &c. and the articles **PAULICIANS** and **MESSALIANS**.

BROWNISTS—a sect of presbyterians, the followers of one Brown. See **PRESBYTERIANS**.

C

CABALISM—a word derived from the Hebrew, signifying Tradition. The Cabalistic art consists in the supposed knowledge and explanation of the essence and the operations of the Supreme Being, of spiritual powers, &c. &c.; and in determining their energies by symbolical figures,—the arrangement of the alphabet,—the combination of numbers, and the pretended method of discovering the hidden sense of scripture by the decomposition of the letters of which it is composed.

The Chaldees had retained the belief of a Supreme Being whom they conceived to be self-existent, and to have originally created, as also still to govern, the universal world. As they acknowledged this Supreme Being to be the very source of existence and fecundity, they thought he was with respect to the universe, much the same thing as the heat of the sun was in regard of our earth. Hence they compared the Divinity to a fire or principle of light. But their reason not suffering them to place God on the list of material beings, they considered this light as infinitely more resplendent, more active, and more penetrating than the light of the sun. Thus does human ingenuity and systematic pride attempt to substitute a wild imagination for the dictates of right reason.

Having proceeded thus far in their investigations of the first cause of all things, the Chaldees pursued their fanciful theorisms, and deemed the creation of the universe to be a kind of emanation from this great principle of light. The various emanations of the primitive light, in proportion as they receded from their source had forfeited, they would have it, something of their activity; and, by the progressive decrease of this activity, they had lost their original levity,—had insensibly condensed themselves, or, if we may be allowed the expression—had weighed each other down. Hence, they became material, and formed the different species of beings which we see contained within the range of nature.

Thus, in the system of the Chaldees, the First Cause or the Supreme Being, was environed with light, the splendor and the purity of which is inconceivable. This luminous region is full, say they, of pure and most blissful intelligences. Next in order succeeds the corporeal world, or the empyreal heaven; which is an immense space illumined by the light immediately emanating from the Supreme Being. It is full of a fire less pure by infinite degrees than the primitive light, although infinitely more subtile and more rarefied than any matter whatever. Under the empyreum is the ethereal expanse, or another vast region in the heavens occupied by a fire still more dense than that of the em-

pyreum, but which nevertheless receives its heat from the empyric element. Below the ether are situated the fixed stars, scattered through an immense plain, in which the denser particles of the ethereal fire have concurred to form these heavenly luminaries. The planetary world comes next in succession to the region of the stars; and this is the space in which are contained—the sun, the moon and the planets, together with the lowest order of beings compounded of matter; which matter not only is devoid of all activity, but even resists the motions and impressions of the light.

In the system of emanations the luminous particles were—spirits, the various orders of which inhabited the spaces extending from the moon to the lightsome mansions of the Supreme Intelligence. The sublunary region which enlightens the earth, the Chaldean philosophers imagined to contain those spirits; which being united to ethereal bodies descended upon earth, and constituted the human species. Thus united—agreeably to the will of the Supreme Being, with human bodies, they entered into other animal bodies when set at liberty by death. Consequently the Chaldees held the transmigration of souls. They conceived moreover, that the goodness of the Supreme Being in uniting these ethereal spirits to human bodies, had consulted their felicity; and that, as matter was totally incapable of giving motion to itself, it was this same order of spirits that influenced and regulated the course of the sun; fertilized the earth with seasonable rains; and were the authors of all the gifts of nature. They termed them the good genii. Other spirits which they considered as the authors of thunder and lightning,—of fiery volcanos, earthquakes, storms and all disasters, they denominated evil genii, and supposed them to be essentially malignant. To each of these two orders of spirits they ascribed a kind of hierarchy, and a certain gradation of jurisdiction and power.

But why did not the Supreme Intelligence, essentially beneficent and good, at once crush to atoms that multitude of evil genii—by the weight of his omnipotence? Some there were, that deemed it below the dignity of the Supreme Being, personally to encounter these malicious spirits, and fancied he had laid this charge upon the good genii: others thought, that the evil genii, naturally depraved, were indestructible; and that the Supreme Intelligence, equally unable to annihilate or to reclaim them, had hurled them down to the centre of the earth, and confined them to the sublunary world, where they exercised their inbred propensity to evil; and that, in order to protect mankind from enemies—so dangerous, so numberless and so formidable, he had sent into the terrestrial world friendly spirits who incessantly defended men against the attacks of these material demons. To both they allotted names expressive of their different functions and degrees of power. These names it was sufficient to pro-

nounce, to evoke or chace them away, as circumstances should require. To find out the proper names of each genius, the Chaldees pretended, was the result of certain combinations of the letters of the alphabet, of which they were composed. The pronunciation of the magic name was a kind of prayer which the genius was unable to withstand; and in this the origin of Cabalism which ascribes to certain arbitrary and enigmatical terms—the virtue of raising spirits, and of working miracles through their medium, seems chiefly to consist. Sometimes the same names were used as a sort of exorcism, in consequence of the idea that the evil genii were banished to the centre of the earth, and that they could do no harm but by eluding the vigilance of the good genii, and thus escaping from their prison to the atmosphere above. When they heard the name of those spirits whose office it was to keep them shut up in the centre of the earth, they fled away like criminals who had escaped from their dungeons,—upon the calling of the watch.

They moreover fancied, that the name or the motto of the genii written or engraved upon medals, obliged those spirits not to quit the person that wore them; and hence, it is probable, originated the superstitious use of talismans.

Such was the philosophic system of the Chaldees; and it was in general estimation throughout almost all the oriental nations, as is attested by every historical monument of their theology and philosophy. These all concur in justifying our conjectures of the origin of Cabalism; although the Jews with whom the term itself originated, were unacquainted with this pretended art, at least till the eighth or ninth century. (See Stanley's History of Oriental Philosophy, Bergeri Cabalismus, &c.)

Inferior deities or genii made a part also of the Platonic system; while the Pythagorean philosophy ascribed a peculiar virtue and efficacy to certain *numbers*. The first philosophers that acquired any knowledge of christianity, wished to reconcile the doctrines of the apostles with the Chaldaic, the Platonic and Pythagorean opinions, and with the tenets of Judaism; and from this heterogeneous compound originated the Eons of the Valentinians, the pretended mysteries of the Gnostics, and the black art, which the greatest part of ancient heretics were not ashamed openly to profess. This *accommodating* passion perpetuated itself among the eclectic philosophers of the third and fourth age: it was renewed at the period when the Arabs introduced into Europe the philosophy of Pythagoras and Plato; and even in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries there have been found—some learned abettors of the idle reveries of the Jewish Cabalism. (Vide Scharmii Introduct. in dialectic. Caballæorum.)

CAINITES—were fanatics of the second age, who had an extraordinary veneration for Cain and other miscreants represent-

ed in holy scripture as the most impious of men; for instance, Coré, Judas the Iscariote, the Sodomites, &c. They were a branch of Gnostics who, to the most abandoned morals, added errors still more execrable and impious. Besides the Creator of the universe, for whom they professed the most frantic enmity, they worshipped an imaginary Principle, a Being of superior dignity,—more wise and powerful than he. They pretended that Cain was son of this Supreme divinity, while Abel was only the offspring of the former. Judas they fancied to have been endowed with extraordinary knowledge and wisdom, and that his motive for betraying our Blessed Saviour to the Jews, was his foresight of the advantages which his death would procure for mankind. Accordingly their gratitude compelled them to express a due acknowledgement of the favor, and to offer Judas extraordinary honours. They had a gospel which they ascribed to him; and from this circumstance they were also denominated Judaïtes. They rejected the Mosaic law, and the dogma of a future resurrection; exhorted mankind to demolish as far as in them lay the works of the Creator, and to commit without remorse all sorts of crimes; maintaining the equally absurd and impious doctrine, that evil actions were conducive to salvation. They imagined angels to preside over sin, and to assist their votaries in committing it: hence they invoked them on such occasions, and paid to them a kind of homage. In a word, their *perfection* consisted in laying aside all sense of shame, and perpetrating without a blush the most dishonest actions.

Most of their abominable tenets were contained in a book which they entitled the *Ascension of St Paul*; in which—under the guise of revelations to that apostle in his famous rapt to heaven, they taught their blasphemous impieties. In the days of Tertullian, a woman of the sect, named Quintilla, appeared in Africa, and perverted many. Her proselytes were called Quintillianists. It appears that this abandoned woman had, if possible, improved upon the infamies of the Cainites.

We should with difficulty be induced to believe, that an entire sect of men could have proceeded to such an excess of mental depravity, were it not attested by the most respectable fathers of the church. We derive our narrative concerning them from St Ireneus, Tertullian, St Epiphanius, Theodoret and St Augustine, who all agree in their account; and the two first on the list were contemporary with these maniacs. The extravagances of fanatics of latter times help not a little to accredit those of ancient heretics. Hornbec (*Controv.* p. 390) instances a certain Anabaptist, whose ideas, with respect to Judas, were similar to those of the Cainites. Hence we may infer, that when once the understanding is seduced by the corruption of the heart, there is no error, no impiety so wicked and absurd, of which our perverse nature is not capable.

CALIXTINS—See HUSSITES.

CALVINISM—The doctrine of John Calvin, a famous reformer, born at Noyon in France in 1509, and deceased at Geneva in 1564. The better to form a correct idea of Calvinism, it will be of service to attend a little to the spirit of its author. Instructed by one of the emissaries whom Luther and his fellow-reformers had sent into France, he undertook to form a system of theology in unison with the opinions of his teachers—a task which hitherto none of the innovating apostles had attempted. This, Calvin flattered himself he should accomplish by his book entitled *Institutio Christiana*, which appeared in print in 1536. In this work he lays down as an uncontrovertible maxim, that the only rule of faith to a true believer, is—Holy Scripture; and that God himself reveals to him by a particular inspiration of the holy spirit, its truth and proper meaning. But how we are infallibly to distinguish between this pretended inspiration and the fanaticism of an impostor, he has not thought proper to acquaint us.

Compelled to abandon his native country, he retired to Geneva, where Farel and Viret had already introduced the principles of the German reformers. Here he quickly forced himself into notice by declaiming against a decree of the synod of Berne, which had presumed to new model the public liturgy. Doubtless Calvin thought himself more fully inspired than this reforming synod. Unfortunately, the synod thought otherwise; and poor Calvin was once more obliged to retreat, though not long after, upon a favourable change of system at Geneva, he was recalled; assumed a kind of absolute religious monarchy; established a consistory; regulated at pleasure the form of service, the rites to be observed in the celebration of the Lord's supper, &c. and invested his consistory with full powers to issue censures and excommunications. Thus this self-commissioned preacher, after inveighing with pious zeal against that authority which the pastors of the catholic church challenged as essential to their ministry, himself usurped an authority a hundred times more absolute and tyrannical, and forced the inspiration with which he had complimented each individual of the faithful—respectfully to acquiesce.

The translator of Mosheim, who pretends that Calvin surpassed all the other reformers by his erudition and talents, is obliged to own that he pushed his temerity, his morose severity and turbulent disposition to still greater lengths. (Vol. 4, p. 91, note.) And what admirable qualities are these—of an apostle! But the consistency of protestants will easily excuse in Calvin and other sectarists of the age, *on account*, say they, *of their superior merit and virtues*, what in the Roman pontiffs they are pleased to ascribe to ambition and lawless despotism, unpardon-

able in *them*, though never carried to half the excess. In what then, it may be asked, did the extraordinary virtues of this furiously crabbed reformer consist? Was it, forsooth, in that christian meekness and forbearance with which, impatient of control, he persecuted even unto death men who, in dissenting from him, thought themselves inspired like himself, and by his own principles had a divine right to follow what appeared to them the dictates of the Holy Spirit? But, in lieu of scripture and the private inspiration of each individual, Calvin found it more convenient now to substitute—his own tyrannical authority as the sole rule of faith at Geneva; and condemned to the flames poor Servetus his fellow reformer, because he could not recognise in the Word of God the same sense and doctrines which he (Calvin) pretended to discern; while at the same time he zealously declaimed against magistrates for prosecuting heretics in France.

Nor has the Calvinism of latter times ceased to be practically inconsistent. It has always taught Holy Scripture to be the sole rule of faith, and that God enlighteneth every believer to discover its true meaning; also, that the sentiments of the fathers, the decrees of councils, the decisions of the church itself, are mere human authority to which no man is obliged to yield assent; and still it has not ceased, in flat contradiction to all these principles—to hold synods, to draw up professions of faith, to condemn reputed errors, and to excommunicate those that professed their adhesion to them. Thus has it treated the Socinians, the Anabaptists and Arminians; who had all an equal title, even on Calvinistic grounds, to commence reformers, as the Calvinists themselves, or their master Calvin. A deist of our times who received his education in the very focus of Calvinism, with much energy and propriety charges the whole sect with this glaring contradiction.

“Your history,” says he, “is full of facts which prove you to have exercised an inquisition most intolerant and severe; and that, instead of suffering the persecutions of others, the reformers soon became themselves relentless persecutors. . . . The protestant clergy arrogated to themselves the exclusive right of defining, regulating and pronouncing upon every thing: each one imperiously dictated to others his own peculiar fancies as a supreme law. . . What man was ever more sarcastic, more imperious, more positive, and more divinely infallible in his own conceit than Calvin? The smallest opposition, the least objection was enough in his estimation to devote the rash man that made it, to the stake: it was a work of Satan, and consigned him to damnation. Servetus was not the only person whose presumption in thinking otherwise than Calvin, cost him his life.”

“Most of his fellow reformers,” continues he, “were, like him, intolerant and violent;—all of them so much the more

criminal, in proportion as they were inconsistent ; that bigoted orthodoxy which they affected to maintain, was itself a heresy according to the principles of the sect." (*Deuxieme Lettre ecrite de la Montaigne*, p. 49, 50, 68.)

A protestant must be blind indeed, to imagine that holy scripture is the only rule of *his* faith. Before he reads this divine book, a youth is already taught by the lessons in his catechism and those of his instructors—to predetermine the scriptural meaning ; and this is the inspiration which conducts him in the perusal of the sacred book. In fact, a Lutheran never fails to recognise in scripture the sentiments of Luther ; a Socinian, those of Socinus ; a member of the church of England, the tenets of the Episcopalians ; just as a Presbyterian thinks he there recognises the doctrines of Calvin. This fundamental defect in the general system of the réformation is alone sufficient to point out its absurdity.

It is hard to conceive what solid answer Calvin and his colleagues would have been able to return a well instructed catholic, that should have argued with them to the following effect : “ You pretend yourselves commissioned by Almighty God to reform the church, while, in reality, you have received your mission neither from any lawful pastor, nor from any christian church whatever. Of course your mission must be extraordinary and miraculous. Make good your claim by miracle, as Moses, Jesus Christ and his apostles—all have set you the example. Luther and divers others declare themselves reformers as well as you : you do not coincide with them ; you teach in many instances a quite different doctrine ; you censure and condemn each other. Which of you am I to believe in preference ? You propose to me the sacred scripture as the only rule of my faith ; but you refuse to acknowledge as scripture, many books which the catholic church assures me are such ; and how shall we decide this important point, which scripture itself leaves undetermined ? You present me with a French translation of the bible. Give me some secure pledge of the fidelity of your translation, of which I am not qualified myself to judge. You say, I must not listen to the authority of men ; you yourselves are mortal men ; consequently I must not yield obedience to your’s, in any thing that you may please to tell me. As holy scripture is the sole rule of faith, it is needless for you to preach, or to expound the word of God at all. I can read as well as you ; it is my duty there to find what God reveals, and not your’s to point it out. You promise me the inspiration of the Holy Ghost to instruct me in the true sense of scripture : very well ; this inspiration itself dictates to me, that you are preaching falsehood ; and that the catholic church alone is privileged to teach the truth.”

The reasoner with his arguments Calvin would quickly have

ordered to execution. “*Such monsters,*” he says, “*must be choaked with fire and smoke, as was here done in the case of Michael Servetus a Spaniard.*” (Calvin’s Letter to Mons. du Poët.) The sanctity of Calvin’s doctrine or of Calvinism, consists principally in the following heads.

1. Absolute predestination and reprobation, independent of the foreknowledge which God has of the good or evil works of each particular person, purely because it is his will, without the least regard to the merits or demerits of men!
2. According to Calvin, God gives to the predestinate faith and justice *inamissible*, and imputes not to them their sins!
3. In consequence of original sin, the will of man is enfeebled—to such a degree, that it is incapable not only of any good work meritorious of salvation, but of any action whatever, that is not vicious and *imputable* as sin!
4. He teaches, that it is impossible for man to resist evil concupiscence, and that free-will consists barely in being exempt from coercion or force, and not from necessity!
5. That we are justified by faith alone; consequently, that good works contribute nothing to salvation; and that the sacraments have no other virtue but that of exciting our faith!
6. That Jesus Christ is not really present in the sacrament of the eucharist, and that we therein receive him by faith only. He admits only two sacraments, Baptism and the Lord’s Supper: all exterior worship, and the entire discipline of the catholic church, he absolutely rejects.

To perfect his new system of theology, Calvin ransacked the various errors of almost every sect, ancient as well as modern; those of the Predestinarians, the Donatists, the Iconoclasts; those of Vigilantius, of Berengarius, the Albigenses, the Waldenses, the Beguardæ, the Fratricelli, the Wicklefites, the Hussites; and finally, those of Luther, and the Anabaptists. In reference to the blessed eucharist, he does not close in with Zuinglius who took it to be a mere figure of the body and blood of Jesus Christ: on the contrary, Calvin says we *verily* receive both the one and the other, yet by faith only! Nor does he admit Luther’s scheme of *impanation* or—the presence of the body and blood of Christ together with the bread and wine, any more than transubstantiation with the catholics. Behold here three different and materially discordant methods—of explaining what Holy Scripture says regarding the blessed sacrament, devised by the three *inspired* chiefs of the reformation! According to Zuinglius, the words of Jesus Christ—*this is my body*—mean only—*this is the sign of my body*. Calvin maintains, that they import something more; since Jesus Christ had promised to give us his flesh to eat. (John 6. 52.) Then, resumes Luther, the body of Jesus Christ is truly present—together with the bread and wine. Not so, cries Calvin: for if we once admit a real presence, we must of necessity admit the catholic transub-

stantiation, and the sacrifice of the mass. How admirably do these divinely commissioned and divinely instructed gospellers accord in uniformity of doctrine!

If we compare what Calvin delivers upon predestination, with what he says of the want of free-will in man, we shall easily conceive that Bolsec had great reason to reproach him with making God the author of sin;—a blasphemy which, horrible as it is, is equally the crime of Luther. What alone, in the ideas of these two champions of protestantism, constitutes the difference between the reprobate and the elect, is simply this,—that God does not impute their sins to the latter, but does so with regard to the former. Is it then consistent with the divine justice to impute to men, the sins which they have it not in their power to avoid; or to damn some, and save others, precisely because it is his pleasure? Calvin's abuse of several passages of scripture, in order to establish this execrable doctrine, itself demonstrates the absurdity of the maxim—that scripture alone is the rule of our belief.

The inamissibility of justice, and the inutility of good works in order to salvation, taught by this reformer and by the Lutheran divines, also involve the most pernicious consequences. They are diametrically opposite to the most formal testimonies of holy scripture, and solely calculated to excite in christians a senseless presumption, and a marked contempt for all the works of piety. That Calvin's doctrine relative to the eucharist is absolutely unintelligible, even Mosheim and his translator are forced to acknowledge. The Calvinists themselves seem, in general, now aware of the inconvenience, or rather the *absurdity* of their master's system: hardly have they retained one single dogma in its original purity: some they have *altered*; others they have softened and found it necessary to modify. They have almost with one accord preferred the sentiment of Zuinglius respecting the Lord's supper; and with him consider it merely as a figure. On predestination vast numbers have adopted the system of Arminius. (See his article.)

Catholic controversialists have combated with success the various tenets of Calvinism, even in its most palliated form. They have demonstrated the formal opposition of its doctrines to scriptural authority, to the most ancient and perpetual tradition of the church, and to the truths which every christian, as such, is bound to admit. Calvin and his associates accused the Roman church of adulterating the religion established by Jesus Christ, and taught by his apostles. The reverse has been proved a thousand times in the fullest evidence. They themselves were the innovators: not one solitary sect throughout the universe before the pretended reform professed Calvinism, or the religion of protestants; they are alike detested and proscribed, in societies which have been separated from the

church of Rome more than fourteen hundred years. Deism and Socinianism are, exclusively, their undoubted offspring. (See Socinianism.)

Calvinism—from its first establishment at Geneva, has there constantly maintained its ground : and, of the thirteen Swiss cantons, six profess the Calvinistic doctrine. Till the year 1572 it was the dominant religion in Holland ; since that period, the republic through motives of policy has tolerated all persuasions, although rigid Calvinism is still the established religion of the state. In England it has been gradually upon the decline ever since the reign of Elizabeth, notwithstanding the lawless efforts of the Puritans or Presbyterians—to promote its interests. When the church of England had discarded in great measure its original fanaticism, the Calvinists were classed among the non-conformists, and were simply tolerated. In Scotland and in Prussia Calvinism is yet in all its purity. In certain districts of Germany it is mixed with Lutheranism, and was tolerated in France till the revocation of the edict of Nantes by order of Lewis XIV.

Doubtless it will be asked, how a system so devoid of reason,—a system calculated to make the most virtuous minds despair, and to confirm sinners in their wicked course ;—to hold up the Deity as a tyrant, rather than an amiable master ; has, nevertheless, found its votaries almost in every department throughout Europe. What we are about to say in order to account for this phenomenon in France, may be remarked, with due proportion, of the other European districts. At the commencement of the sixteenth century a reform of morals, and, in some instances, of discipline too, was certainly much wanted. The councils of Constance and Basle had laboured hard to procure it, as well in regard of the head, as of the members of the church ; but, unfortunately, without the desired success. With the actual state of things, all were discontent, and every circumstance announced an approaching revolution.

At the close of the fifteenth century, Alexander VI. had scandalized the church by his infamous excesses and ambition. His successor Julius II. more intent upon warfare and conquest than attentive to the government of the faithful, was a mortal enemy to France, and was hated in proportion. Leo X. who succeeded him, had not too much pontifical virtue, and but little zeal for reform. In a word, it was easy to foresee that the general discontent, and the abuses of the times, would quickly occasion a revolt against the papal authority itself.

Hence it is not surprising, that the emissaries of Luther and his fellow reformers found every where disciples eager of seduction.—To declaim immoderately against the pope,—against the clergy both secular and regular ; and—to censure with much heat and pretended zeal religious abuses—was an expedient

which never failed to obtain attention. The practice of confession, fasting, works of satisfaction; the observance of vows, attendance at the public service, and the maintenance of the ministers of religion—were now become a hardship no longer to be borne; and an opportunity now presented itself of throwing off the yoke. The poison spread so rapidly among all ranks and conditions of life, that those whom it had tainted were themselves astonished at their numbers. The books of Luther, Melancthon, Carlostadius and Zuinglius, and those of other reformers, lighted up the torch of fanaticism throughout the kingdom. It mattered little what principles were embraced, provided a change of religion were effected. Calvin's famous work determined the choice in favor of Calvinism.

The disaffection of the people towards the actual government in France, had not been less favorable to the revolution in question than were the abuses in the ecclesiastical polity. Francis II. a feeble and inactive prince, left the administration of affairs to the Duke of Guise. The grandees jealous of this rival authority, espoused in opposition the Calvinistic cause, and formed the conspiracy of Amboise in concert with that party; which, though eventually defeated, did not fail to raise more enemies to government by the punishment itself of the conspirators, and thus to hatch new projects of revolt.

Upon the accession of Charles IX. to the throne, it was his wish to reconcile the two parties; and with this view he accorded a general amnesty for the past. But an unfortunate though accidental tumult at Vassy, in which several Calvinists lost their lives, was made the pretext of a civil war; and it was prosecuted by both parties—with all the fury that fanaticism could inspire; till at length the protestants dictated to their lawful sovereign the terms of peace. A king thus reduced to treat with his own rebel subjects, does not easily pardon the affront; and Charles IX. conceived the rueful project of ridding himself by assassination of the Huguenot chiefs. The populace thus habituated to carnage, stopt not here, but proceeded in the work of blood till some thousands had been immolated to their fury. This nefarious act of treachery was followed by another civil war; which Henry III. at length terminated by a treaty still more favourable than the former to the cause of Calvinism. The discontented catholics, in their turn, formed a league which they very improperly denominated sacred; and now became as untractable as the Huguenots themselves. Henry IV. who had been educated in the principles of the reformation, after a long and doubtful contest with the Leaguers, was at length universally acknowledged as lawful sovereign, and granted to the Calvinists a new edict of pacification similar to the preceding ones, termed the pacification of Nantes. In the reign of Lewis XIII. the protestants again flew to arms; but were unsuccessful, and

beheld their places of security ceded to them by Henry IV. dismantled and in ruins. Lewis XIV. more puissant and despotic than his predecessors, revoked the edict of Nantes in 1685; and, from that epoch down to the late revolution, the Calvinists have not been allowed the *public* exercise of their religion.

This narrative, short and uncircumstantial as it is, may suffice to give a tolerable idea of the lamentable evils which a pretended reform of the catholic religion caused to France;—a reform which, far from purifying faith and morals, has revived, as we have already noticed, a multitude—of erroneous doctrines proscribed in the different ages of the church; a reform—whose principles overturn the very basis of morality centered in the liberty of man;—throw tender consciences into despair, and the wicked into a fatal security;—do away every motive of practical virtue, and from their very birth, have inspired their fanatic votaries with a sovereign contempt, alike of civil and ecclesiastic subordination. Recovered at length from their ancient bigotry, the bulk of Calvinistic doctors easily admit, that the Romish church which they thought proper to abandon, holds no *fundamental* error, either in its doctrine, its morality, or its form of worship; and that a good catholic may work out his salvation in the profession of his own religion. Why then, may we be allowed to ask, was all Europe involved during the lapse of more than an entire century in anarchy and disorder, for its destruction and the establishment of Calvinism in its place? The tumult and confusion consequent upon its introduction into France, (and the same may be generally asserted with truth in regard of other nations) are fairly deducible from the avowed maxims of the chief reformers. In 1520, before any edict had been issued against Luther, he asserted in his book on *Christian Liberty*, that the christian owes subjection to no man; and inveighed in terms of the utmost virulence and disrespect against all crowned heads and sovereigns indiscriminately. This was a prelude to the wars of the conquering Anabaptists. In his public Theses he maintained it to be a sacred duty to dethrone alike, both popes and emperors who should espouse their cause. In his treatise, *On the Common Treasury*, he countenanced the rifling of churches, of monasteries, and of bishoprics; and deemed it in the ordinary course of things—that the gospel should occasion tumult, and be ushered in with blood. Such was the spirit which accompanied his turbulent emissaries into France.

Calvin inculcated in his writings the charitable task of *exterminating*—the bigoted miscreants, as he termed them, who should dare to oppose the reformation. *Lettres de Calvin a Mons. du Poët et Fidelis Expositio*, &c. Ought any government whatever to extend the benefit of religious toleration to such mutinous and violent characters as these? Their sectarists were faithful imitators of their masters. Bayle, who lived in the midst

of Calvinists, and was perfectly acquainted with their character, in his *Avis aux Réfugiés*, in 1690, reproaches them with having carried the licentiousness of envenomed satire to an excess heretofore without example; with having from their very birth disseminated over France defamatory libels, a species of composition till then almost entirely unknown in that extensive kingdom. He reminds them of the edicts which their extreme audacity had extorted from the magistrates against them, in order to repress the unprincipled malignity with which their frantic ministers—with the bible in their hand—were wont to calumniate the living and the dead. This their unchristian demeanour he contrasts—with that moderation and edifying patience which the catholics in England under similar, though much more trying circumstances, had exhibited—to the admiration of all Christendom.

“There is no barrier of public tranquillity,” continues Bayle, “which you have not burst in sunder; no tie calculated to ensure obedience to the legislature, which you have not dissolved. . . . Thus have you verified the apprehensions conceived of you at your first appearance, and have fully justified the remark—that whoever disregards the authority of the church, will soon renounce submission to the civil powers; and after equalizing the pastors with their flock, will presently disclaim all superiority of the magistrate over private individuals.” In a word, this deistical writer, whom no one will suspect of partiality to the church of Rome, makes it appear, that even the heathens taught a doctrine more pure than was their’s, regarding obedience due to the laws of our country; and he refutes with much energy and argument, the flimsy apologies by which they sought to palliate their unwarrantable propensity to rebellion. He had already shewn (*response a la lettre d’un réfugié*) that the Calvinists were, and always had been, much more intolerant than the catholics,—a fact which they themselves had proved both by their intemperate writings and their conduct; and that it is an inviolable principle with them, that *no king has a right to reign* who is not strictly orthodox in their own distorted sense of the word. He tells them—that they themselves had compelled Lewis XIV. to revoke the edict of Nantes, and that in so doing, at the very most he had only followed the example of the states of Holland, who were in the habit of violating every treaty entered into with catholics. He had demonstrated, that in every protestant country the law was more intolerant and severe against catholicism, than were those of France against the Calvinists. Their lamentations upon the pretended persecution raised against them, he deems ridiculous; and he declares to them, that their demeanour is a complete justification of that severity, with which they have been treated. (*Œuvres de Bayle*, tom. 2, p. 544.)

With respect to the doctrines which Calvin disapproves, they had already been denied and combated by a multitude of discordant sects. These sects had, in their turn, been all condemned in proportion as they attracted notice. Their errors, however, had been transmitted down to the sixteenth century, either by the unconnected remnants of the sects themselves, or through the medium of church history. Those of the Donatists, of the Predestinarians, of Vigilantius, Berengarius and the Iconoclasts, &c. reappeared in the Albigenses, the Valdenses, the Beguardæ, the Fratricelli, in Wicklef; Huss and the brethren of Bohemia; and finally—in Luther, the Anabaptists, Carlostadius, Zuinglius, &c.; great part of them Calvin adopted and modelled into his own not less heterodox system of religion, the various articles of which we have refuted under the heads of REFORMATION, LUTHER, ICONOCLASTS, BERENGARIUS, VIGILANTIUS, &c. &c.

CAP-MEN—so called from their wearing a white cap, to which they attached a small plate of lead as the distinctive badge of their association, the purport of which was, they said,—to compel those at war to live in peace. With this view they formed a schism both in civil and religious matters, and separated from all society with other men. The first author of this sect was a certain visionary, who about the year 1186 pretended, that the blessed Virgin had appeared to him, and had shown him her image together with that of her Divine Son—on which were inscribed the following words, *Lamb of God who takest away the sins of the world, grant us peace*: that she had commanded him to form an association, whose members should always wear the image and a white cap—the symbol of peace and of innocence; should oblige themselves by oath to keep peace with one another, and force their neighbours to do the same.

The general discontent occasioned by the endless divisions, intestine broils and universal anarchy of this unhappy age, helped to keep in countenance this humorous conceit of the Cap-men. They did not fail to meet with patrons, and every where gained proselytes to the cause, particularly in the provinces of Burgundy and Berry. Unfortunately, these pacific brethren, to propagate the work of peace, began by making war, and maintained themselves by pillaging those that hesitated to join their party. The bishops and nobility, compelled to oppose force with force, quickly repressed the fanatical banditti. But their spirit of insubordination and revolt was soon revived in the Stadhingi, the Circumcellions, the Albigenses, the Valdenses; who were guilty of the like and worse disorders. In the succeeding century, there appeared in England *Cap-men* of a different species: they were the sectaries of Wicklef, who made it a matter of scruple and very conscientiously refused, to uncover their heads in presence of the most holy sacrament.—These enthusiasts may be consi-

dered as the predecessors of George Fox, and his disciples called *Quakers*.

CARPOCRATIANS—the disciples of Carpocrates, a pretended convert and an ignorant philosopher of Alexandria in the second age. His morals were licentious; and he fell into the same errors with Basilides and Saturninus, who were nearly his contemporaries; and also added other strange ideas of his own. He and his adherents abandoned themselves to every kind of debauchery and excess; reprobated fasting and mortification, and sought in all things the gratification of their lawless passions. The honesty or dishonesty, innocence or criminality of an action, consisted, according to these immoral casuists, merely in the imagination.

Carpocrates had a son—a youth of extraordinary parts—called Epiphanius. He wrote in justification of his father's principles, and soon became the idol of the sect. Dying at the age of seventeen he was worshipped as a god, and had a temple erected to him at Samé, a town of Cephalonias; where the Cephalonians assembled every first day in the month to celebrate the feast of his apotheosis. They offered sacrifice to this new divinity, instituted rejoicing days, and chaunted hymns to his honor.

The Carpocratians regarded Jesus Christ simply as a human being, although more perfect than the rest of his fellow mortals; believed him to be the son of Joseph and Mary, and acknowledged his miracles, and the reality of his sufferings and death. Nor were they accused of denying his resurrection, but only that of other men at the last day; and of affirming that only the soul of Jesus Christ ascended into heaven.

Some of these sectaries, however, affected to esteem themselves equal, nay even superior to Christ in miracles and virtue; and, to impose upon the ignorant they practised magic,—a thing very common with the pretended philosophers of those days. As the summit of their perfection was the very depth of vice, we may give them credit for their superior virtue, too. Such is the edifying portrait of these ancient heretics drawn by St Ireneus, (l. 1, c. 24,) than whom no one could be better qualified to give a correct account, contemporary as he was with the sect itself. The rest of the fathers represent them in the same light. The pagans, unable to discriminate between true and false christians, attributed to the whole body the disorders of a few fanatics, and the magical collusions employed by the latter, discredited in their eyes the genuine miracles wrought by the apostles and their disciples. The fathers of the church remarked this inconvenience. (Epiph. Hær, 34, &c.)

CATHARI OR PURITANS—this name was assumed by the Montanists, the Manichees, the Novatians, the Albigenses, and final-

ly, in England by the Presbyterians. It is generally under the mask of virtue and a pretended reform, that innovators seduce the simple, and procure patronage. But an affected regularity which originates from a spirit of contumacy and revolt, is commonly of short duration, and often only an artifice to cover real disorders. When once they become the reigning sect, they assume quite a different character, and show what they really are, without disguise. So many examples of this kind of hypocrisy a thousand times renewed from the infancy of the church, ought, one would think, effectually to undeceive mankind. But, unfortunately, they are ever ready to take the bait anew. (Bergier Diction. Theol.)

CATHOLICS—are all those christians of whatever nation or description, who live in communion with the see of Rome. The occasional epithet *Roman* is totally superfluous, as no denomination of christians ever went by the name of catholics but themselves alone. Far, however, from being a discredit to them; was not St Paul himself a *Roman* catholic when he wrote his epistle to the *Romans*, and commended their faith as already celebrated through every part of the globe where the gospel had yet been announced? St Ireneus, before the year 200, calls the *Roman* the “greatest and the most ancient church, which is known to all, founded at Rome by the two most glorious apostles Peter and Paul:—a church,” says he, “which retains the tradition received from them, and derived through a succession of bishops down to us. Showing which,” continues this learned and primitive father, “we confound all that out of self-conceit, love of applause, blindness or certain false pretences, embrace unorthodox opinions. For, to this church alone, on account of its higher presidentship, it is necessary all other churches, that is, the faithful in every place, should have recourse. In this church the *tradition* of the apostles is faithfully preserved. . . By following this tradition, many barbarous nations profess the faith *without the use of the written word*. These,” says he, “would stop their ears against the blasphemies of sectarians, who have nothing but the novelty of their doctrine to recommend them. For the Valentinians were not before Valentinus, nor the Marcionites before Marcion, &c. All these arose much too late.” And will not the argument apply with redoubled force against the reformers of these latter times? If Marcion and Valentinus, who appeared so early as the second age, were excepted against by St Ireneus as the teachers of *new* doctrines, what must be said of those who did not appear before the sixteenth, seventeenth, or even eighteenth centuries? Whereas, the claim of catholics to antiquity can never be contested. The Donatists indeed, who separated from the catholic church at the commencement of the fourth age, like its adversaries of the

present day, maintained, that it had ceased to be the church of Christ. But the great St Augustine demonstrated with invincible force the unreasonableness of their exceptions, and proved against them and against modern reformists,—that the church is composed of both good and bad; but that the *good* are not to be found *out of its pale*. He allows indeed, those to be brethren in the eyes of God, who are of the true church in the sincere desire of their hearts, and use their best endeavours to discover it, when deprived of its external communion merely by the circumstance of *invincible* or inculpable ignorance, though God alone must be the judge of this interior disposition; while the church considers exterior acts or circumstances as the direct object of her laws of discipline. This maxim St Augustine clearly teaches in his letter to Glorius, Eleusius and other Donatists, written about the year 398; where he says: “They who defend their opinion, though false and perverse in itself, yet with no obstinate malice, as having received it from their parents; and diligently seek the truth—in readiness of heart to be reclaimed when they have found it, are by no means to be ranked with heretics.” (Ep. 43. ol. 162. T. 2. p. 88.) Did but our protestant brethren reflect, that this is precisely the opinion of catholic divines at the present day, they would not charge them with the want of charity in maintaining the doctrine of what is called exclusive salvation. For did not St Paul maintain this doctrine, when in the list of evil works which exclude their actors from the kingdom of heaven, he numbered heresies and sects? And will any one accuse him of uncharitableness in so doing?

Roman catholics therefore, we assert, are scriptural catholics, and belong exclusively to that true church which all christians profess with their lips, as often as they recite their creed: *I believe the holy catholic church*:—*Catholic* in the commission addressed to her by Christ in the persons of his apostles and their successors in the ministry, with a promise of his personal assistance till the end of time. “Go teach all nations. . . saith he, and behold I am with you all days even to the consummation of the world.”—*Holy*, if not in all her members, at least in her doctrine and morality, by which thousands of her children actually do attain to an eminent degree of holiness; and *all might* do so, were they obedient to her laws. Thus much evidently, our common creed insinuates; and nothing short of this can verify its import. Is it not an insult to religion and a libel upon common sense—with Luther and the book of Homilies to insist,—that for the long lapse of eight hundred years and more before the times of this reformer, the church of God was buried in idolatry; and that all its members—from the throne to the dunghill—were involved, without exception, in the horrid guilt of so damnable a prevarication? What then became of the promised aid and presence of our Divine Redeemer and his Holy Spirit—to guide its pastors

into all truth?—The church of God, *the pillar of truth* upholding the most execrable falsehoods and authorising practices the most impious and anti-christian! Oh! strange and worse than fanatic impudence! Were there nothing but this wild sentiment alone in the blasphemous effusions of Luther's pen, this were alone sufficient, completely to discredit in the eyes of good sense, his pretended mission to reform the christian world. From this one instance the intelligent reader will appreciate that authority, which stigmatizes the catholic for practices held by him in sovereign abhorrence, and for wicked doctrines a thousand times with the most solemn asseveration disavowed. See under the various articles LUTHER, WICKLEF, &c. &c., the several controverted points of catholic discipline and dogmas of religious faith, vindicated from the odious and groundless aspersions of our much prejudiced and much misguided brethren.

Catholics, moreover, have the advantage of all other christian societies in point of number. They are in Europe alone computed to amount to near one hundred millions of souls. Consequently, in Europe alone they vastly outnumber the whole collective body of the reformed, with all their multifarious and discordant branches, divisions and subdivisions—of Lutherans, Luthero-Calvinists, Calvinists, Calvino-Lutherans, Anabaptists, Socinians of five hundred different descriptions, Presbyterians, Brownists, Puritans, Independents, Fifth Monarchy-men, Church of England-men, Quakers, Methodists, Swedenburgians, and the Lord knows what countless sects of infatuated enthusiasts—as much at variance among themselves, as they all are with the catholic church. Without speaking of Italy, Spain, Germany, Poland, &c. or of past ages, when England, Scotland, and the other nations now protestant, together with those vast regions of Africa and Asia that are now Mahometan, professed the catholic religion;—down to the late revolution, there were more men of learning, and more universities in France alone, than in all the protestant dominions put together. Hence, as Dr Gibson rightly observes, in his conference with the late Honorable Edmund Burke—if in any single instance the opinion of mankind should have its weight, it preponderates in favour of the catholic religion; this “having had and still having the far greatest number of supporters—of all ranks and denominations,—of bishops, clergymen, kings, and parliaments, &c.; and as it is agreed on all hands, that only one religion is right in itself, it being repugnant that God should reveal opposite truths or contradictions,—it is plain as demonstration on what side the balance inclines. The great St Augustine assigning his reasons for adhering to the catholic church, expresses himself in the manner following:—Many motives, says he, keep me in the bosom of the catholic church;—the general consent of nations and people;—an authority grounded upon miracles, upheld by

hope, perfected with charity, and confirmed by antiquity ;—the succession of bishops from St Peter to our time ; and the name of *catholic* ; a name so peculiar to the true church, that though all sectaries denominate themselves *catholics*, yet when you ask in any country whatever—where catholics meet, they have not the assurance to point to the places where themselves assemble.” (L. cont. Ep. Fundamenti, c. 5.) The same incomparable doctor of the church did not hesitate to say : “ I would not believe the gospel itself, did not the authority of the church move me to it ;” and with reason too ; for how should we know infallibly—what is gospel, if the church had not ascertained the important query ? In his book, *On the Advantage of Believing*, he says : “ Why shall we feel any difficulty in throwing ourselves upon the authority of the catholic church, which always has maintained herself by the succession of bishops in the apostolical sees, in spite of all the attempts of heretics whom she condemned ;—by the faith of the people ;—by the decision of councils, and by the authority of miracles ? It is the proof either of great impiety or extreme arrogance—not to acknowledge Her doctrine for a rule of christian faith.” Hence it is not through disaffection ; but through a sense of the superior duty which they owe to God, and to the church established by Him ;—a church whose faith has been professed through a long-continued series of ages—by councils, parliaments and sovereigns, and in a word by the great majority of christians ; that catholics cannot conscientiously embrace a different religion. “ Here are fixed the boundaries of the so much boasted *liberty of conscience* : it cannot claim a right of superseding the repeated and uninterrupted decisions of this great majority,—of this collection of the discernment, learning and virtue of all the most splendid ornaments of every christian nation. But if any,” continues Dr Gibson, “ will be presumptuous, and pretend to a further claim of individual sense and acuteness, and refuse a like liberty to catholics ; such, if consistent even with themselves, must admit—that liberty of conscience is an empty sound, and fictitious pretext of self-creating superiority, repugnant to common reflection and the general method of deciding on other concerns ; much more so on revelation, which comes by hearing that which has been heard or seen ;—not by opposition to the testimony of general or catholic acceptance. This it would be as absurd to compel a person to reject, as it would be to punish one who did not know the alphabet, for not professing the knowledge of languages.—Much is said against forcing the conscience of one exalted individual : is it then more reasonable to compel, or to impose restraints upon many millions who are united to the great body of christians of the present and all preceding ages, and by such compulsion force the *unlearned* to prefer their own *igno-*

rance and stupidity to the decisions of the most general and enlightened councils of whole christendom? Why should a single individual be constrained to protest and even swear, in any case, against such authoritative decisions? If so, may we not conclude that the supposed liberality, and the boasted liberty of conscience, of this nation consists—in despising, protesting and swearing against—the judgment of the universal church, and even of its own progenitors, who all agreed in the same belief!

Are these extraordinary protests—may we ask—supposed to be the result of any solid investigation of motives of credibility, or the reverse? or are they not rash, at the best, and bigoted in the extreme; contrived originally to answer some political or sinister view, but at present unnecessary for any purpose, and tormenting to the mind of the sincere. For how can peace be found in such a dissent from the general belief—in the most important affair of man? Is it possible to conceive, that a religious and *thinking* mind should not experience most excruciating torment, at the idea of abjuring the highest authority upon earth;—an authority which God has sanctioned by the most credible promises of support:—and, by such a deed—of acting as if there were no *revelation* at all—as if no Redeemer had ever appeared, or spoken, or given law to man!"

The leading articles of catholic faith are contained in the creed promulgated by Pope Pius IV. in 1564, the year after the close of the council of Trent, and agreeably to what the council had suggested. It goes under the name of Pius, and is subscribed by catholics on several important occasions; it runs thus:—

I, N. N. with a firm faith do believe and profess—all and every one of those things contained in that creed, of which the holy Roman church makes use. *To wit*;—I believe in one God the Father Almighty, Maker of Heaven and Earth, of all things visible and invisible: and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, and born of the Father before all ages: God of God; Light of Light; true God of true God: begotten, not made; consubstantial with the Father by whom all things were made. Who for us men, and for our salvation, came down from heaven, and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made man: was crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate,—suffered and was buried: and the third day he rose again, according to the scriptures. He ascended into heaven; sitteth at the right hand of the Father,—and is to come again with glory to judge the living and the dead: of whose kingdom there shall be no end. And in the Holy Ghost the Lord and Giver of life, who proceedeth from the Father and the Son; who together with the Father and the Son is adored and glorified; who spoke by the prophets:—and one holy, catholic and apostolic church. I confess one Baptism for the re-

mission of sins ; and I look for the resurrection of the dead and the life of the world to come. Amen.

I most stedfastly admit and embrace the apostolical and ecclesiastical traditions, and all other observances and constitutions of the church. I also admit the Holy Scriptures according as our holy mother the church understands, and has always understood them ; to which it belongs to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Scriptures : neither will I ever take and interpret them otherwise than agreeably to the unanimous consent of the Fathers.

I also profess, that there are truly and properly seven sacraments of the new law, instituted by Jesus Christ our Lord, and necessary for the salvation of mankind, though not *all* for each one *individually* : namely, Baptism, Confirmation, the Eucharist, Penance, the Extreme Unction, Order and Matrimony :— and that they confer grace ; and that of these, Baptism, Confirmation and Order, cannot be reiterated without sacrilege.

I also receive and admit the received and approved ceremonies of the catholic church, used in the solemn administration of the aforesaid sacraments.

All and every one of the things defined and declared in the holy council of Trent, concerning Original Sin and Justification, I embrace and receive.

I profess likewise, that in the Mass is offered to God, a true, proper and propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead. And that in the most holy sacrament of the Eucharist, there is truly, really and substantially the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ : and that there is made a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood ; which conversion the catholic church calls transubstantiation. I also confess that under either kind alone, Christ is received whole and entire, and a true sacrament.

I constantly hold that there is a Purgatory (or a temporary place of suffering after death) : and that the souls therein detained are helped by the suffrages of the faithful.

Likewise, that the saints reigning together with Christ, are to be honored and invoked ; that they offer prayers to God in our behalf, and that their relics are to be had in veneration.

I most firmly do maintain, that the images of Christ, of the ever-Virgin mother of God, and also of other saints, ought to be had and retained ; and that due honor and veneration is to be given them.

Also I affirm, that the power of indulgences was left by Christ in the church ; and that the use of them is most wholesome to christian people.

The holy, catholic, apostolic Roman church I acknowledge for the mother and mistress of all churches ; and I promise true

obedience (in matters of religion) to the bishop of Rome, as successor to St Peter, prince of the apostles, and vicar of Jesus Christ.

I likewise undoubtedly receive and profess all other things delivered, defined and declared by the sacred canons and general councils, and particularly by the holy council of Trent: and I condemn, reject and anathematize all things contrary thereto, and all heresies which the church hath condemned, rejected and anathematized.

I, N. N. do at this present freely profess, and sincerely hold this true catholic faith, without which (at least in desire and the sincere disposition of the heart) no one can be saved: and I promise most constantly to retain and confess the same entire and inviolate—with God's assistance—to the end of my life.

The rule of catholic faith is—all that, and that only, which God hath revealed, and the catholic church proposes to the belief of all.

Catholic faith concerning justification through Christ, and the merit of good works, teacheth—I. That when man has sinned, the remission or pardon of sin is not attainable by him, otherwise than *in* and *by* the merits of the sufferings and death of Jesus Christ, who freely purchased our redemption.

II. That it is only through the same merits of Jesus Christ, that the just man can obtain either an increase of holiness in this life, or eternal happiness in the next.

III. That the good works of the just man proceeding from grace and charity, are so far acceptable to God, through his goodness and his sacred promises, as to be truly deserving of an eternal reward: "God crowning his own gifts, when he crowns the good works of his servants."

On faith in Christ, the catholic church maintains—that the merits of Jesus Christ, though infinite in themselves, are not applied to us, otherwise than by a right faith in him. This faith is—one, entire, and conformable to its object; which object is divine revelation, that is—the truths taught by Christ; and to that revelation, or to those truths, faith gives an undoubting assent.

On the Divine Revelation the catholic maxim is—that in it are contained many mysterious doctrines, surpassing the natural reach of the human understanding: for which reason it became the wisdom and goodness of God to provide some way or means, whereby man might be enabled to learn what those mysterious doctrines were.

II.—That the way or means to arrive at the knowledge of these divine truths, is—attention and submission to the voice of the legitimate pastors of the church—established by Christ for the instruction of all the faithful; spread for that end, in a greater or a less degree, through the remotest regions of the

earth; visibly continued in the succession of pastors and people through all ages. Whence the marks of this church are—unity, visibility, indefectibility; uninterrupted succession from the apostles; universality or catholicity, and sanctity.

III.—That the church designated by these distinctive characters;—thus established, thus continued, thus guided in one uniform faith and subordination of government—is that which is termed the Roman catholic church; the qualities just mentioned being, evidently and exclusively, applicable to her alone.

From the testimony and authority of the catholic church we receive the scriptures, and believe them to contain the revealed word of God: and as the church can assuredly tell us what particular book is the word of God; so can she, with like assurance, tell us the true sense and meaning of it in controverted points of faith; the same spirit of truth which directed the writing of the scriptures, directing also the church to understand them aright, and to teach all such mysteries and duties as are necessary to salvation. *He that believeth not, shall be condemned*, Mark. xvi. v. 16, and *he that will not hear the church, let him be to thee as the Heathen man and the Publican*, Matt. xviii. v. 17. Away then with *private sense and interpretation*, as directly contrary to the express injunction of our blessed Saviour, and to his most faithful apostle St Peter who says, that scripture is not to be expounded by *private interpretation*, 2 Peter i. v. 20.

Catholics hold that faith is unchangeable, and that of course the pastors of the church, who are, in a certain sense, the body representative, either dispersed or convened in council, have received no commission from Christ to frame *new* articles of faith—articles of faith being, exclusively, divine revelations;—but to explain and to define to the faithful—what anciently was, and still is, received and retained as *of faith* in the church,—when debates and controversies arise concerning them. These definitions in matters of faith only, and proposed as such, oblige—under pain of heresy—all the faithful to a submission of their judgment.

Nor is it an article of catholic faith, that the church cannot err in bare matters of fact; or in matters of speculation or civil policy, depending merely on human judgment or testimony. These things are not revelations deposited in the church; in regard of which alone she has the promised assistance of the Holy Spirit.

With regard to the contested primacy of St Peter and his successors in the see of Rome—catholics believe, that superior and peculiar powers were given to St Peter, and that the Bishop of Rome, as his successor, is the *Head* of the whole catholic church; in which sense, as already stated, this church may therefore be fitly styled *Roman catholic*, being a universal body united under one visible head.

It is no article of catholic belief, that the pope is in himself *infallible*, as separate from the church, even in expounding articles of faith: by consequence, papal definitions or decrees, in whatever form pronounced, considered independently of a general council, or the acceptance of the church, oblige none—under pain of heresy—to an interior assent.

Nor do catholics, as catholics, believe, that the pope has any direct or indirect authority over the temporal concerns of states, or the jurisdiction of princes. Hence, should the pope pretend to absolve or to release his majesty's subjects from their allegiance on any pretext whatever, such dispensation they would view as frivolous and null.

Neither, in the belief of catholics, can any licence be given to men—to lie, to forswear or perjure themselves; to massacre their neighbours, or disturb their country, on pretence of promoting the catholic cause: furthermore, they believe, that all pardons or dispensations granted or pretended to be granted, in order to such ends or designs, would have no other validity or effect, than to add sacrilege and blasphemy to the above crimes.

Detesting the immoral doctrine of *equivocation* and *mental reservation*, the catholic church inculcates and ever did inculcate, that simplicity and godly sincerity are truly christian virtues, necessary to the conservation of justice, of truth, and the common security.

Catholics believe, that there are seven sacraments, or sacred rites, instituted by our Saviour Jesus Christ, whereby the merits of his passion are applied to the soul of the worthy receiver—

1. That in the most holy sacrament of the eucharist, there is truly and really contained the body of Christ, which was delivered for us,—and the blood which was shed for the remission of sins: the substance of the bread and wine being, by the power of God, converted into the substance of his blessed body and blood; the species or appearances of bread and wine, remaining as they were. This change has been properly called Transubstantiation.

2. That Christ is not present in this sacrament according to his natural manner of existence; that is, as bodies exist naturally: but in a manner proper to the character of his exalted and glorified body. His presence then, is real and substantial, but sacramental;—not exposed to the external senses, nor obnoxious to corporal contingencies.

3. That the body of Christ in this holy sacrament, is not separated from his blood, nor his blood from his body; nor is either of them disjoined from his soul and his divinity: but all and the whole living Christ is entirely contained under each species: so that whoever receives under one kind, becomes truly

partakers of the whole sacrament: he is not deprived either of the life-giving body or blood.

4. That our blessed Lord, in bequeathing to us his body and blood under two distinct species or kinds, instituted not only a sacrament, but also a sacrifice;—a commemorative sacrifice distinctly shewing his passion and death until he come. For, as the sacrifice of the cross was performed by a distinct effusion of his blood; so is that sacrifice commemorated in this of the altar, by a distinction of the symbols. Jesus, therefore, is here given not *to* us only, but *for* us; and the church is hereby enriched with a true, proper and propitiatory sacrifice, usually termed the *Mass*:—propitiatory, we say; because, representing in a lively manner, the passion and death of our Lord, it is peculiarly pleasing to our eternal Father, and thus more effectually applies to us the all-sufficient merits of the sacrifice of the cross.

The catholic church also teaches, that sincere repentance or sorrow of mind, joined to a firm resolution of amendment, was at all times so necessary, that without it there could be no remission of sin: but that, when a sinner repents of his sins from his heart, and acknowledges his transgressions—to God and to his ministers the dispensers of the mysteries of Christ, resolving to turn from his evil ways and to bring forth worthy fruits of penitence,—there is then, and not otherwise, an authority left by Christ to absolve such a penitential sinner from his sins: which authority, catholics believe, Christ gave to his apostles and their successors—the bishops and priests of his church—in these words: *Receive ye the Holy Ghost, whose sins you shall remit, they are remitted unto them, &c.* John xx. 22, 23.

The essential parts of penitence considered as a sacrament, are three—Contrition, (or a supernatural sorrow of mind) Confession, and Satisfaction—without which, in the case of grievous sin,—unless from unavoidable obstacles the two last, confession and satisfaction, cannot be complied with,—the sinner according to the catholic doctrine cannot obtain forgiveness from God.

By *Confession* is understood—the declaration which the penitent sinner makes of his sins, to the minister of God: the obligation of which evidently follows from the words of Christ (John xx. 22, 23.) above quoted. For, to what purpose was this power given to the apostles and their successors in the ministry, if it imposed not on the sinner the obligation of making known his sins? Or—how could the power be exercised, if no sins were manifested to the priest?—Although with protestants it is generally neglected, and even ridiculed by many, it is notwithstanding sanctioned and recommended by the church of England in the book of Common Prayer (*Visitation of the Sick*) precisely as now practised in the catholic church.

On the doctrine of satisfaction, catholics believe that—although no creature can make what is termed *condign* satis-

faction, either for the *guilt* of sin, or for the *pain eternal* due to it—this kind of satisfaction being proper to Christ our Saviour only,—yet penitent sinners, as members of Christ, may in some measure satisfy—by prayer, fasting, alms deeds, and other works of piety, for the *temporal* pain which, in the order of the divine justice, sometimes remains due after the *guilt* of sin and *pain eternal* have been remitted, as in the case of David (II. Kings, alias II. Samuel, c. xii.) Such penitential works, notwithstanding, are no otherwise satisfactory, than as joined and applied to that satisfaction which Jesus made upon the cross, in virtue of which *alone* all our good works find a grateful acceptance in the sight of God.

By that dispensation of mercy which in the catholic church is called an *indulgence*, such *temporal punishment* only, is remitted, as in the order of divine justice may remain due after the *guilt* has been forgiven.

Catholics also maintain the doctrine of *purgatory*, that is to say,—a place or state where souls departing this life—with remission of their sins as to the *guilt* or *eternal pain*, but yet liable to some *temporal punishment* still remaining due, or not perfectly freed from the blemish of some defects which are called *venial* sins, are purged before their admittance into heaven, where nothing that is defiled can enter. (Rev. xxi. 27.)

They moreover believe, that souls so detained in purgatory, being the living members of Christ Jesus, are relieved by the prayers and suffrages of their fellow members here on earth. But where this place may be—of what nature or quality the pains—how long souls may be there detained—in what *manner* the suffrages offered in their behalf are applied—whether by way of satisfaction or intercession, &c. are questions superfluous and impertinent as to faith.

The *extreme unction*, so called from the oil used on the occasion, catholics believe to be a sacrament administered to dying persons—to strengthen them in their passage out of this life into a better: and they maintain it to be divinely instituted. (See James v. 14.)

Order too, they believe to be a sacrament, by which the ministers of the church are consecrated, and power is given to them to perform such public offices, as regard the service of God, and the salvation of souls.

Catholics likewise hold *matrimony* to be a sacrament of the new law, instituted by Christ, whereby a new dignity is added to the indissoluble contract of marriage, and grace is given to those who worthily receive it.

The catholic christian is taught also to believe, that Christ has given to the pastors of his church power to enact religious laws, which all the faithful are bound to obey. Such, for in-

stance, as are those of Lent, Ember-days, the vigils of saints, abstinence at certain times, and the like.

Nor are catholics ashamed to pay due honour to the relics of saints; and they place holy images and pictures in their churches, the more easily to recollect their wandering thoughts, and to fix their memories on heavenly things; although God alone is the object of their worship and supreme *adoration*. They shew moreover, a respect for the representations of Christ—the myterious facts of their religion, and the saints of God—beyond what is due to any profane figure; not that they imagine any *virtue* to reside in them, for which they ought to be honored; but because the honor exhibited to pictures is referred to the prototypes, or the things represented by them.

They maintain also, that honor and respect are due to the bible, to the cross, to the name of Jesus, to churches, &c. as things peculiarly appertaining to God, without any danger whatever—of idolatry; and to *kings*, magistrates and superiors: to whom honor is due, honor may be given without the smallest derogation from the majesty of God, or that divine worship which is exclusively appropriate to Him.

Finally, catholics believe, that the angels and the saints in heaven, replenished with charity, pray for us their fellow members here on earth, and rejoice in our conversion;—that seeing God, they see and know in Him all things suitable to their happy state; and that God may be inclined to hear their requests in our behalf, and for their sakes may grant us many favors:—therefore, they believe it is good and profitable to invoke their intercession. Can this manner of invocation be in fact more injurious to Christ our *Mediator*, than it is for one christian to beg the prayers of another here on earth?—However, catholics are not taught so to rely on the prayers of others, as to neglect their own duty to God—in imploring for themselves his divine mercy and goodness; in mortifying the deeds of the flesh; in despising the world; in loving and serving God and their neighbour; in following the footsteps of Christ our Lord, who is the way, the truth, and the life. The orthodoxy as well as the antiquity of the above and other articles and approved ceremonies of the catholic religion, are exhibited in their noon-day evidence by the Rev. Joseph Berrington, in his late learned and useful publication, inscribed—*The Faith of catholics confirmed by Scripture, and attested by the Fathers of the five first centuries of the church; whence hath been borrowed the sketch which I have just given of the catholic belief.* They will also in their proper places be found to be satisfactorily discussed in the course of the present compilation.

See the articles—*LUTHER, VIGILANTIUS, WICKLIFF, ZWINGLIUS, &c. &c.*

Ceremonies.

In the administration of the sacraments and in other parts of her religious offices, the catholic church uses many rites and ceremonies which have been derived from the most ancient times. This alone would be a sufficient plea for their retention; as from this circumstance arises an additional proof of the antiquity of her faith and discipline. But these ceremonies, as they had in their primitive introduction; so in their retention they still possess other advantages: they excite attention; they impress the mind with a certain awe: to the unlearned they convey instruction; and on all occasions, departing from the usages of common life, they give a peculiar dignity and character to whatever action is connected with the service of the Almighty. Nor does this ceremonial part of our religion, enforced by what God himself commanded in the old law, any more than the rich dresses of its ministers, the decorations of its churches, and the general pomp of service accompanied with incense, lights and music—where circumstances will allow it,—in any degree affect that christian simplicity inculcated by the gospel; the seat of which is in the heart;—or that adoration of the Father *in spirit and in truth*, (Jo. iv. 23.) which Christ demands from his followers.

For each particular practice in the catholic church, which falls under the head of ceremonies, the authority, were it necessary, might be adduced—of primitive times; as each is recorded in the writings of the fathers. Of antiquity—the badge and glory of their church, even in things seemingly of small importance, or not always agreeable to modern notions, catholics are solicitously retentive.

One of these usages—the retention in the Divine service of the Latin tongue—protestants particularly disapprove. On this subject it may suffice with the learned author of the faith of catholics confirmed by scripture and attested by the fathers, &c. to remark, that the *Deposit* of catholic faith being intimately interwoven with the primitive expressions of the liturgies in ancient use, when the Greek language ceased to be spoken in the many nations which formerly constituted what was called the Greek church; and even, as at present, was not understood; the language of the liturgy remained unaltered, as was and is the case among the Syrians, Cophts, Armenians and Ethiopians. Every where the service is celebrated in a tongue no longer intelligible to the vulgar. On what grounds then is it required, that the Latin or Western church should have followed another rule, particularly as in this church, in all the countries within its pale, the Latin language in the early ages was every where sufficiently understood, if not spoken? And when the Northern

nations were reclaimed to the christian faith, the established rule was not altered—for this additional reason,—that the use of the same tongue in the public service might help to unite them more closely to the old church, and tend in some degree by this approximation, to soften and civilize their manners.

The general accord among all nations professing the catholic faith—not to admit any change in the language of their liturgies, though in many other points of discipline they were much divided,—is a curious and important fact. And it must have rested on some general motives equally obvious to all. Doubtless they saw—what daily experience confirmed—that modern languages were liable to change, while those that were no longer spoken,—from this very circumstance, and because, from the valuable works written in them, they were cultivated by the learned—were become permanently stable. They saw that the majesty and decorum of religious worship would be best maintained, when no vulgar phraseology debased its expression; that the use of the same language which a Chrysostom spoke at Constantinople, and a Jerom at Rome, would unite in a suitable recollection modern with ancient times; and that the mere fact of the identity of language would be a convincing proof of the antiquity of the catholic faith: and although it may be objected, that the people do not understand the *words* of the liturgy—the supposed inconvenience which equally prevailed in the Jewish worship without a censure from our Divine Redeemer, is done away; since all instruction in sermons and catechism, is delivered to them in their own tongue; every part of the service is diligently explained, and not a single shade of darkness is permitted to remain.

It is certainly most gratifying, and highly profitable when a catholic travels into distant countries, every where to find a service performed,—to the language and the ceremonies of which his ears and eyes have always been habituated. He can join in the offering without embarrassment; and though removed, perhaps, a thousand miles from home, the moment he enters a church, in the principal offices of religion he ceases to be a stranger. The council of Trent, the more effectually to prevent this ancient usage from proving an occasion of ignorance in the people, orders all pastors and such as have the cure of souls, frequently, and especially on Sundays and holidays, to expound some portion of what is read, and some mystery of the holy sacrifice, (Sess. xxii. c. viii.) Moreover the whole of the church service is translated into the language of each country, and together with a variety of prayers for all occasions and all states of life, put into the hands of the people. If with all this caution ignorance should still be found—as it will be found in many—every ingenuous mind will ascribe it to the usual causes of ignorance—to neglect and inattention, and not to any want of

knowledge of the Greek or Latin tongues. This ought abundantly to suffice to reconcile the candid reader to the catholic practice in this instance: the bigoted, prejudiced, and the insincere will still find cause to cavil.

CATHARI—See the article **MANICHEES**.

CERDONIANS—Sectaries who followed the opinions of Cerdo the Syrian. Cerdo adopted the errors of Simon Magus, travelled to Rome in the days of Pope Hyginus, and there disseminated his errors, sometimes privately, at other times in public and without reserve. When reproved for his temerity, he affected to be penitent, and pretended a desire to return to the communion of the church. His repeated relapses manifested his hypocrisy, and eventually procured his absolute exclusion.

Like the greater part of the heretics of the second age, Cerdo maintained, that the universe was not the production of a God all-powerful and wise; and to him the law of Moses appeared imperfect,—too severe to originate with a Being infinitely good. To do away the imaginary inconvenience, he admitted two principles as the efficient causes of all things; the one good, the other evil. The latter he supposed author of this visible world, and of the law of Moses. The former, which he called the unknown principle, was according to him, the father of Jesus Christ. But the humanity, the nativity, the sufferings and death of the Son of God, he said, were all in appearance only, not real. He believed the resurrection of the *souls* of men, but not their *bodies*: consequently, he held that the soul died together with the body. All the books of the Old Testament he rejected, and with regard to the New, he thought proper to admit a part only—of the gospel of St Luke, retrenching all the rest. Marcion and his disciples held the same erroneous tenets. (See **MARCIONITES**.)

CERINTHIANS—were the disciples of Cerinthus, who after a course of philosophy at Alexandria, towards the close of the first century, propagated his heterodox opinions principally in Asia minor. The apostle St John undertook the writing of his gospel in order to refute him, with other false teachers of that early period. Conformably to the ideas of Plato, Cerinthus imagined, that God was not himself the immediate author of this visible world; but that he had created spirits or intelligences—one more or less perfect than another; that one of them had framed the universe, and that they all had a part in its government and administration. Like Basilides he pretended, that the God of the Jews was one of these intelligences,—the author of their law, and of the various events which had attended them. Their

religious code he wished partially to preserve, and blended it in many points with christianity.

Jesus Christ, he said, was born like other men—of Joseph and Mary, although gifted with a wisdom and perfection more than human: that at the moment of his baptism, the Son of God or Christ had come down upon him in the form of a dove; had revealed to him God the Father, till then unknown to man, whom he was destined to instruct; and had imparted to him the power of working miracles: that at the hour of his passion, Christ had taken his departure to his heavenly Father; and that Jesus alone had suffered; had expired upon the cross; had risen from the dead: but that the Christ, who was a pure spirit, was altogether incapable of suffering. Such were too, the errors of Carpocrates; but the disciples of Cerinthus improved upon their master's reveries.

The Cerinthians seem not to have long subsisted as a distinct sect, nor to have survived even to the times of the famous Origen. Probably they had been confounded and identified with some other sect of the second age.

CHALDEANS or NESTORIANS of SYRIA. See the article NESTORIUS.

CHILIASTS. See MILLENARIANS.

CIRCUMCELLIONS—a branch of Donatists in Africa—of the fourth age. See the article DONATISTS.—This name was given also to certain enthusiasts who appeared in Germany about the middle of the thirteenth century. In the heat of the famous contests between the emperor Frederic and the popes, under the specious pretext of defending the cause of their sovereign, they complimented the Roman pontiffs with the title of heretics, and the bishops and other prelates their adherents—with the additional epithet of Simoniacs: they pretended too, that the entire body of the priesthood being in the state of mortal sin, no longer possessed the privilege of consecrating the eucharist; and that they were mere impostors: that neither the pope, nor bishops nor any man living had a right to impose an interdict upon their flock: that the Franciscan and Dominican friars seduced the church of God by their false teaching and their sermons;—and that, in a word, out of the Circumcellion society no one lived according to the gospel. In the close of their harangue they informed their auditors, that they were going to impart to them the benefit of an indulgence—not like those which the pope and the bishops had devised, but one which came immediately from the throne of God. (Dupin 15 e. siecle. D'Argentré. loc. cit.) Part of their errors have been since revived by some of our modern reformers.

CLANCULARIANS—a sect of Anabaptists. See the article.

CLAUDIUS of TURIN—with a variety of other heterodox opinions, adopted at the commencement of the ninth age, the errors of the Iconoclasts and Vigilantius. Some abuses which he observed in the devotion of the faithful with respect to images and the relics of saints, determined him to contest the lawfulness of the devotion itself. He was a person, it would seem, of singular exemplarity of life, but destitute of proper discernment; and his zeal was not tempered with prudence and moderation. He was refuted by Dungal, Walafrius Strabo, and by Jonas of Orleans, and condemned by the council of Paris which declared, that images were to be retained in the churches for the instruction of the ignorant; but by no means *adored*, or venerated with any superstitious worship. (Mabil. Annal. Ord. Ben. l. 29. n. 52, &c. Conc. T. 7, p. 1943.) See ICONOCLASTS, VIGILANTIUS, &c.

CLEMENT—a native of Scotland, rejected alike both canons and councils, together with the religious writings of the fathers, and their explications of holy scripture. He pretended that Jesus Christ, descending into hell, had delivered thence the souls of all the damned, even those of infidels and idolaters; and maintained many other erroneous doctrines concerning predestination. He was condemned with Adalbert in the council of Soissons, and in another synod held at Rome. Conc. T. 4. Bonif. Ep. 135. In Clement, as in many others, we may remark a striking instance of the abuse of learning, to which, for the age in which he lived, he had considerable pretensions. When not influenced by humility, learning itself becomes a snare, against which the apostle admonishes us, when he says, that *science puffs up*; and with great reason he exhorts us *to be wise according to sobriety*.

CLEBIUS, or CLEOBULUS—was contemporary with Simon Magus, and like him undertook to combat christianity. He denied the authority of the prophets, the omnipotence of the Divine Being, and the resurrection. The formation of the universe he ascribed to angels; maintained that Jesus Christ was not born of a virgin; and was author of a sect called from him Cleobians. (Euseb. Hist. Eccles. l. 4, c. 21. Theodoret, Hæret. Fab. l. 3.)

CÆLICOLÆ—worshippers of the firmament, or of the stars—were condemned as pagans and proscribed in that capacity by special rescripts of the emperor Honorius. As they were ranked among the Jews in the Theodosian code, they were probably apostates from Christianity to Judaism, but did not adopt the

entire system, and were not subject to the high priest or the Sanhedrim, as were the rest of the Jews. They had however their superiors whom they termed elders like our modern presbyterians. But we do not know in what *precisely* their errors consisted. The heathens called the Jews *Cœlicolæ*; and of them Juvenal says: *nil præter nubes et cœli numen adorant*. Other pagan authors accuse them of worshipping the angels, meaning the genii or intelligences which, they imagined, animated the stars. The ancient prophets had frequently reproached them with this superstition; and it was, in fact, a species of idolatry most generally diffused among the Oriental nations. To this St Jerom refers the passage of St Paul to the Colossians, c. 2, v. 18, where he supposes the apostle understood by the angels—the spirits which presided over the firmament, and the heavenly bodies. According to him, the Jews and Pagans were both involved in this form of heathenish worship. (Epist. 151, n. 10, Cod. Theod. l. 12, *de Judæis et Cœlicolis*.) Protestants have thought fit to retort the charge upon St Jerom himself, no less than upon the catholics in their legitimate veneration of the angels and saints.

COLARBASSUS—a celebrated Valentinian, who appears to have applied to the system of Valentinus the principles of Cabalism and judicial astrology. Men, he pretended, received the benefit of life from the seven planets; and he ascribed all perfection and the plenitude of truth to the Greek alphabet, because Christ was named Alpha and Omega. (Autor. Append. ad Tert. de Præscript. c. 53.)

COLLEGIANS—a sect of Arminians and Anabaptists in Holland, so called from their assembling every first Sunday in the month: on which occasions each individual assistant has the privilege of speaking and expounding the Holy Scripture,—of praying and singing psalms. These collegians are now all Socinians, or Arians. They do not take the communion at their meeting-house or college, but convene from every part of Holland twice in the year at a village called Rinsbourg, two leagues from Leyden, where they receive their eucharist. The celebrant is the person who accidentally sits down first at the table: he administers indiscriminately to all the attendants—without enquiring what may be their system of religion. Baptism is given by immersing the whole body of the party in water.

To speak with accuracy, this is the only society of protestants who act consistently with the grand maxim of the reformation, constituting each private person the arbiter—of his own belief, of the kind of worship which he thinks fit to render to the Deity, and the discipline which he chooses to adopt. In fact, their communion establishes among the members—a union merely

nominal and external,—not that harmony of faith and sentiments which St Paul so energetically recommended to the faithful. (Philipp. i. 27, ii. 2, &c.) Jews and even Pagans themselves, without prejudice to their conscience, might fraternize with *this* society of protestants.

COLLUTHIANS—were sectaries of the fourth age, the disciples of Colluthus a priest and curate of Alexandria. This priest, scandalized at the condescension with which St Alexander, patriarch of that see, at first had treated Arius, in order the more effectually to reclaim him, formed a schism, and even presumed himself to ordain priests—without having ever received the episcopal character; arrogating to himself this power—to enable him, he said, to oppose with effect the progress of Arianism. He moreover held, that Almighty God had not created the wicked; and denied that human afflictions originated from Him. Colluthus was condemned in a council convoked by Osius at Alexandria in 319.

COLLYRIDIANs—were a kind of devotees to the blessed Virgin. They paid her a very fanciful sort of religious veneration, which consisted in offering cakes termed in Greek COLLYRIDES; and hence the sect derived its name. In this ceremony the women performed the office of priesthood. They had a chariot with a quadrangular table in it, which they covered with a cloth; and at a stated season of the year they presented a loaf; offered it up in the name of the Virgin Mary; and then each of them partook of the oblation. This practice St Epiphanius justly censured as idolatrous, and also as contrary to the prohibition of the apostle, who formally excludes the sex from discharging any sacerdotal function.

THE CONSCIENTIOUS—an ancient sect of religionists, so called from their acknowledging no other law, no other rule of conduct, but the dictate of their own conscience. This doctrine was renewed in the seventeenth century by Matthew Thoutsen a German, who exchanged this error for the more impious system of Atheism. (See Fatalism discussed, vol. 1.)

COPHTS or EGYPTIANS—a sect of Jacobites or Monophysites, who admit only one nature in Jesus Christ. They are subject to the patriarch of Alexandria. Dioscorus patriarch of that see, a man of great influence, and much respected in Egypt, notwithstanding the condemnation of Eutyches in the council of Chalcedon in 451, remained obstinately attached to his cause and erroneous doctrine. He succeeded in persuading his clergy and the people, that the council of Chalcedon by condemning Eutyches, had justified and adopted the heresy of Nestorius;

although in fact this council equally reprobated and anathematized them both. The severities and the violence which the emperors of Constantinople employed, in order to enforce the decrees of the council, alienated the affections of the people in Egypt; who were excluded in consequence, from all civil, ecclesiastic and military dignities; and conceived the most violent hatred against their persecutors, and even against catholicity itself. Great numbers retired with their schismatical patriarch at their head, into Upper Egypt; and when the Saracens or Mahometan Arabs undertook about the year 660 the invasion of Egypt, the Cophts or schismatic Egyptians treacherously surrendered into their hands the fortified places, and thus obtained of them the public exercise of their religion. The Mahometans, however, quickly forgot their services, and deprived them of this privilege, which they were compelled to redeem by dint of money. They are now reduced to the inconsiderable number of about fifteen thousand; though they are said to have amounted to no less than six hundred thousand at the period of the Saracen conquest.

Ever since the Arabic became the vulgar language in Egypt, the nations have wholly laid aside their original Cophtic tongue, which is a compound of the Greek and ancient Egyptian. Nevertheless, they continue to celebrate the divine office in that language, and have it translated into the vulgar tongue, in order to prevent their being ignorant of what is said. They have three different liturgies;—those of St Basil, St Gregory Nazianzen, and St Cyril of Alexandria: they were all translated into the Cophtic language from the original Greek. The last of the above liturgies bears the nearest resemblance with that of St Mark, which is supposed to be the same in use before the schism of Dioscorus, or anterior to the fifth age. The catholics of Egypt continued to use it, as long as they subsisted under the united persecutions of the Cophts and infidel Mahometans. The schismatics corrupted their liturgies in one instance only, by inserting their error of the unity of nature in Jesus Christ. It is the only doctrinal error with which they have been charged: in every other point of christian doctrine, they hold precisely the same articles with the church of Rome. In their liturgies and their confessions of faith, they acknowledge seven sacraments. Immediately after baptism, they give the child confirmation, as also the communion under the species of wine alone. The real presence of Jesus Christ in the eucharist, and transubstantiation, they with equal ardor uphold; and the sacrifice of the mass. This is a fact which their liturgies abundantly demonstrate. Confession is not in frequent use among them; once or twice in the year at most, suffices. However, they ascribe to penitence and absolution the efficacy of pardon, and generally accompany them with certain unctions. In their

liturgies are mentioned also—the invocation of saints, and prayer for the dead. Nor have there ever been any other changes introduced into these liturgies, but that alluded to above; as is manifest from their perfect agreement in all other points with those of the Greeks, the Syrians, the Armenians and Nestorians; with whom the Cophts have had as little communication, as with the church of Rome. Consequently, with the reserve of one single article, namely, the unity of nature in Jesus Christ, the Cophtic church has preserved exactly the same religious creed with the Roman catholic; and before the council of Chalcedon, and the schism of Dioscorus, this belief was that of the universal church. It is then without foundation that protestants accuse this faith of novelty, and as the invention of more modern times. Its doctrines, we beg leave to repeat, are fairly recognisable in the different schismatical churches—of the Greeks, of the Syrian Jacobites, and the Nestorians in Persia and the Indies, as well as those of the Egyptians and Ethiopians. These churches—equally, for the most part, at enmity with each other, as with the church of Rome, cannot with any semblance of probability be suspected to have changed—by common consent—their faith, their liturgies and their discipline. Providence seems to have preserved them, only to attest the antiquity of those doctrines, which protestants have made the pretended motives of their separation from the catholic church. The latter are, in fact, the only sectaries in the universe, who profess that creed which they vainly affect to stifle—the ancient and primitive belief! This circumstance alone ought to have its weight with sober minded protestants, and make them re-examine, with modest diffidence, their very feeble claim to church antiquity.

If it were true, that the faith which catholics profess at the present day, was not *always* the faith of the true church, the change must have taken place before the days of Eutyches. But we have proved under the article NESTORIUS, that this faith was general before the first council of Ephesus, and even anterior to that of Nice; and that even at that early period it could not be of recent date. Consequently, the faith of the church of Rome is the faith of the primitive christians. Why then, may we ask, did the first reformers cause a schism? And why should not the protestants of our times return to the communion of that church which, in reality, professes no other creed than that of primitive christianity? How frivolous, how void of common decency and of common sense, is Dr Tillotson's apology for separation; resting it, as he does, upon the pretended difficulty of salvation in the Roman church! Let our readers judge impartially, and seriously consider—on what ground they stand.

CYNICS—were a sect of philosophers—the followers of Antisthenes—who discarded every rule of morality and decorum. The name was given also to the Turlupins, who abandoned themselves publicly and without remorse, to the most shameful enormities.

CULDEES—if we may credit Mr Brewster (see the article in the British Encyclopedia)—were a sect of perfect christians established in our British isles, who held at an early period the doctrines of protestantism, and particularly Presbyterianism. This fanciful progeniture of the reformation we shall not so easily concede to the learned, and not much less *prejudiced* ingenuity of its author; although we conceive, that even should we grant him what he wishes to make good, it would follow only, that he had discovered an *invisible* society, brought down almost from the apostolic ages through the medium of a few scattered individuals, probably, perhaps, by no means certainly, existing in different parts of Christendom, nearly till the dawn of the reformation. What kind of a church by the bye, would this constitute? Such a one, at the very best, as the great St Augustine was willing to allow the Donatists to be; cooped up, as he observes, in a corner of the Roman empire, while the true church of Christ embraced within its pale a large proportion of the then known world.

But the *most* probable account of the Culdees states, that they were monks who flourished in Ireland and Scotland in the middle ages. They were called Culdees, that is, servants of God, from the Latin words *cultores Dei*—because they employed much of their time in preaching and teaching, and in prayer. No mention is made of them by Nennius in the seventh, or by Bede in the eighth age—notwithstanding the confident assertions of Mr Brewster. They seem not to have been known before the ninth century, when we find them at *St Andrew's*; though we are not ignorant that Hector Boetius, and other Scottish writers, pretend them to have been as ancient as christianity itself, in Scotland. In England, they appear *never* to have had any settlement, except at *St Peter's*, in York. Their rule was borrowed from that of St Basil who, every body knows, was no Presbyterian. (See Usher's *Antiq. Eccl. Brit.* fol. 333, 334, 346, 638, 659. Collier *Eccl. Hist.* vol. 1, p. 180; and Tanner's *Preface to Notitia Monast.* Butler's *Lives of SS.* vol. 5, p. 174. Ed. Edin.)

In the latter ages, the Benedictine and other religious orders had several monasteries and provinces in Ireland: but the regular canons of St Augustine were far the most flourishing in that country, as the Benedictines were in England. The bishops and parsons of Ireland were mostly taken out of their body. (Butler, *ibid.*) What then becomes of Mr Brewster's

grand succession of Presbyterians? The latter gentlemen, moreover, do not appear to have had any mighty veneration for their supposed monkish ancestry; since they have uniformly treated every thing that had the slightest vestige in it of monachism—with indignity and contempt.

Bede indeed, informs us, (l. 3, c. 4, Hist. Eccl.) that from St Columba, who never was himself made bishop, the whole island of Hy—its bishops not excepted—by an unusual law was subject to the abbot. Of this passage the Calvinists avail themselves; as if it made against the superiority of bishops in the church. But Usher (Antiq. Eccl. Brit. c. 16) justly observes, that this superiority was only of civil jurisdiction—not of order. For the Ulster annals mention, that this little island had always a bishop, resident either in or near the monastery. Also Adamnan, in his life of St Columba (l. 3) says, that St Columba himself refused to officiate at the altar in the presence of a bishop, who out of humility had concealed his character; nor would he receive the communion with him; but through respect for his dignity compelled him to celebrate the divine mysteries alone. And Bishop Lloyd, in his historical account of church-government, demonstrates, (c. 5, 67) that no other than the episcopal was ever established among the Picts, Scots, or Saxons. Veneration for St Columba introduced a superiority of *civil* jurisdiction over the bishops; who were chosen from amongst his monks and disciples, and retained their former respect for their old superior the abbot. Perhaps his princely extraction too, may have contributed something towards this extraordinary privilege; which was continued to be enjoyed also by succeeding abbots.

The *unimportance* of keeping Easter with these suppositious Culdees—at an undue season, in opposition to the practice of the universal church, Mr Brewster, doubtless, is better qualified to appreciate, than the first general council of Nice, which deemed it necessary to require of all christians an acquiescence in this particular, under pain of retrenchment from catholic communion. *Obedience* to lawful superiors, Mr Brewster cannot be ignorant, *is better than sacrifice*, and that *it is grievous as the sin of witchcraft to rebel*. Contumacy in this one point—without insisting on the many other still more important charges against these favorite Culdees, enumerated by Mr Brewster without a proof, would have sufficed completely to do away the merit of their otherwise exemplary virtues. If they were not canonically condemned by the catholic church, it was—either because their errors were not known, or—far more probably—because they have existed only in the inventive imagination of late reformers.

Nor are the words of Bede in his approbation of the maxim by which he says, the disciples of St Columba regulated their practice, to be taken in their literal *protestant* sense; otherwise he would never have blamed, as in fact he did even in the great

St Aidan, (l. 3, Hist. Eccl.)—a deviation from the catholic custom in keeping Easter. This he is willing to excuse in him, only on the ground of inculpable ignorance and unintentional insubordination. See more upon the subject in the article **QUARTO-DECIMANS**; also upon episcopacy, in that of **AERIUS**.

CYRENAICS—appeared about the middle of the second century. They pretended, that we ought not to pray; because our blessed Saviour had assured us, he knew what each one stood in need of. (Hofman's Lexicon.)

D

DADOES—head of the Messalians. (See that article.)

DAVID of DINANT—disciple of Amauri whose principles he wrote a book to defend. At that time there were still in France some remnants of the Cathari or Manichees, who denied the authority of churchmen and rejected the ceremonial institutions together with the sacraments; they called in question—the resurrection, the distinction of virtue and vice, and other points of faith; and thought they recognised the proofs of their opinions in the system of Amauri, which they accordingly embraced. They pretended that God the Father had assumed our human nature in the person of Abraham, and God the Son in the person of Jesus Christ: that the kingdom of Jesus Christ was at an end, and by consequence the sacraments were now deprived of their former efficacy, and the ministers of God were left without jurisdiction and lawful authority, in as much as the reign of the Holy Spirit was now come; and, finally, that religion ought henceforth to be confined wholly to the interior.

Hence these sectaries concluded, that all the actions of the body were in themselves indifferent. Indeed, sectarists in general—men for the most part of a character—ardent and impetuous, and of strong and untamed passions, never fail to deduce these consequences from principles like those of Amauri; and, with them, have never been at a loss to justify their most lawless excesses. Accordingly the Davidians indulged without restraint in every species of licentiousness, and formed a sect which for some time practised its infamies in secret, but was at length detected by the depositions of some of its supposed proselytes, and quickly suppressed by the severity of the laws enforced against these lawless miscreants. The memory of Amauri was justly stigmatized; and his bones were taken from the tomb,

and burnt to ashes. The works of David of Dinant were also committed to the flames.

DAVID-GEORGIANS—the followers of one David George, a glazier, or according to some, a painter of Gand, who after the example of other reformers began to dogmatise in 1525. He was first an Anabaptist, and then proclaimed himself the Messiah, commissioned from above to people heaven which, for want of persons qualified by their virtues to be admitted there, remained empty. This maniac reprobated marriage with the Adamites; denied the resurrection with the Saducees, and with Manés, held that sin did not defile the soul. The law of self-renunciation established by Jesus Christ, he ridiculed; esteeming all pious exercises useless, and reducing all religion to a kind of pretended contemplation. He died at Basil, where he went by the name of John Bruch, in the year 1556. He left behind him some disciples, to whom he had promised, that after three years he would rise again; at the expiration of which term, the protestant magistrates of Basil, informed of the pernicious tendency of his errors, caused him in fact to *rise again*, and ordered his remains, together with his impious writings, to be burnt by the hands of the common hangman. Some remnants of this ridiculous and impure sect are said still to subsist in Holstein, particularly at Friderichstadt. The pretended spirit of reform produced many other sects equally extravagant and impious, and shews what ignorance, combined with hypocrisy and fanaticism, is capable of attempting under the sacred plea of correcting abuses in religion.

DEISTS—From the Deists themselves we look in vain for an adequate definition of Deism. They tell us, that a Deist is *one who acknowledges the existence of a God, and believes in natural religion.*

1. To this mutilated definition they should add—and *who rejects all revelation.* Whoever admits *any revelation* in religion, no longer classes among Deists.

2. The Deist *acknowledges the existence of a God*; but of what description? Is it *the universal nature* of Spinoza, or the *soul of the universe* admitted by the Stoics; an indolent and passive divinity like those of Epicurus, or a vicious one like the Pagan gods;—a God without Providence, or a Supreme Being who is the great Creator, the Legislator, and the Judge of men? Hardly shall we find two individual Deists, who are agreed upon this solitary article of their very meagre creed.

3. What do they understand by their *natural religion*? Why, they will tell you—that form of worship which human reason *left to itself*, teaches us to render unto God. But, unfortunately for their fine-spun system, human reason, in fact,

never is *left to itself*, unless perhaps in the fictitious hypothesis of some poor savage—abandoned from his very birth by the cruelty of an unnatural parent, to herd with the beasts of the forest; will then the Deist have the goodness to inform us;—what religion in particular would a human creature thus brutified adopt? Most probably his ideas on this head, if any at all, would be eccentric as the circumstances of his education. If there exist a religion exclusively entitled to the epithet of *natural*, why did not Plato, Socrates, Epicure, and Cicero, recognise it equally with the Deists of our day? For our part, we acknowledge ourselves too dull to comprehend—why a religion which never had a being upon earth, and never could have been devised but by *philosophers*, enlightened from their early infancy through the medium of christian revelation, should of excellence be denominated *natural*.

4. This chimerical religion consists, say they, *in adoring God*, and living a life of honour and integrity. But—how are we to adore God! Merely by an interior worship, or by sensible signs;—by the Jewish sacrifices, or those of the heathens;—according to the caprice of individuals, or agreeably to some stated form?—All this, it would seem, is matter of indifference in the eyes of Deists; and in this hypothesis, all the absurdities, and all the crimes perpetrated through a motive of religion by ancient or more modern infidels, constitute this *natural religion* of Deism. Moreover, all are reputed men of integrity and honor, with the Deists, that observe the laws of their country, however unjust and unnatural these may be. The Chinese, for instance, —in selling, in exposing, and even murdering his children; the Arabian—in plundering and ill-treating strangers; the Algerine—in pirating on the open seas. If all this is consistent with Deistical integrity, their morality is as pliant as their symbol of belief.

Deism, therefore, may fairly be defined—the doctrine of those who admit the existence of a God—without explaining their notions of the divinity;—a worship without determining its form;—a natural law—without any knowledge of its precepts: and who reject revelation without so much as investigating the proofs of its existence. In a word, it is a system of irreligion without the semblance of conviction,—the unhallowed privilege of believing and of acting as one pleases. If it be pretended, that the system is backed with argument, this is mere delusion; it all consists in sophistical objections against revelation,—in sophistry as shallow and inconclusive, as its doctrine is devoid of reason and destitute of truth.

The Deists acknowledge protestants to be their progenitors; but think them timid reasoners in not daring to advance—when there was no obstacle to impede their progress on their way to truth. The first Deists appeared, in fact, immediately after

the Socinians, and were previously protestants. In England, they began to shew themselves under the protectorship of Cromwell, in the midst of the contests between High-churchmen, the Puritans and Independents. Their irreligious system passed thence into Holland and France, where it quickly generated Atheism. For it is a well-known fact, that all the fashionable infidels in those countries, after preaching Deism for fifty years, ultimately professed the still more impious code of Atheism in almost all their succeeding publications.

DESTRUCTIONISTS—maintain that the wicked shall not be tormented *for ever*, but only for a limited duration till they shall have suffered punishment apportioned to their crimes; after which they shall be finally *destroyed*. The protestant self-interpreting principle will easily bear them out against the not less arbitrary expositions of their brother reformists. They have an equal right to put what gloss they please, on those scriptural texts which militate in opposition to their respective systems: and here we will take our leave of them, and leave them to wrangle with each other for the superiority of their individual private sense, without the possibility of ever solving the question in debate—by appealing to their so much boasted rule of faith;—a rule, indeed, confessedly inadequate to establish uniformity of doctrine, or to settle the unstable mind in any thing like a well grounded security with reference to the vital concern of religious orthodoxy. It gives a latitude which every sectarian is at liberty to abuse—to the evident endangering of christianity itself! Its votaries are perpetually *tossed to and fro with every wind of doctrine*—ever wavering in faith, and adulterating the gospel maxims which they once revered as the oracles of truth. If then it be asked—what is the rule of faith to christians? The answer is very plain and obvious: Hear the church: for, *if he will not hear the church*—it is the precept of our Lord and Saviour (Matt xviii. 17.)—*let him be to thee as the heathen and the publican.*—But—how must I recognise this true church in order to submit to its unerring guidance? Its distinctive marks are—unity of faith, sanctity of doctrine and morals, catholicity and succession from the apostles. These peculiar characters of the church of Christ are luminous as the light of heaven: open your eyes; and, in despite of prejudice itself, you must behold it. Consult your common creed wherein this church is designated under the odious epithet of *catholic*. In the Nicene symbol too, you profess that you believe—*one holy, catholic and apostolic church*! Oh! frightful; bigotry will exclaim! Do you then refer us to the long exploded religion of *Roman* catholics? I say not so, unless it can be fairly proved—that these two epithets are inseparable. See the article CATHOLICS.

DOCETES—those sectaries in globo, who maintained that Jesus Christ had not assumed any real body, but only a fantastic one. (Clem. Alex. Strom. l. 7, Theodoret, l. 5, Hæret. Fab.)

DONATISTS—commenced a schism in Africa in the year 311, and were so called from their leader Donatus. The pretended plea for their separation from the catholic church, was—the election of Cecilian to the episcopal see of Carthage upon the demise of Mensurius. Although the election had been perfectly regular, a powerful intrigue set on foot by the silly resentment of a certain lady called Lucilla, and supported by the disappointed ambition of Botrus and Celesius who had themselves aspired to that dignity, intruded one Majorinus in his place. This extraordinary procedure they endeavoured to accredit by the plea, that the ordination of Cecilian having been performed by Felix of Aptongum, whom the schismatical party falsely charged with having delivered up the Holy Scriptures and sacred vessels to the persecutors,—was consequently null and invalid. The bishops who espoused the cause of Majorinus, were headed by Donatus of Casæ-Nigræ.

Pope Melchiades in a council held at Rome, at which assisted Maternus of Cologne, Neticius of Autun, and Marinus of Arles, together with fifteen Italian bishops; as also Cecilian and Donatus, each of them accompanied by ten bishops of their party, pronounced in favor of Cecilian. This took place in 313.

In 314 the Donatists were again condemned in a synod at Arles, and finally, by an imperial edict of Constantine in 316. They now became more obstinate in their schism; and, to palliate their obstinacy, they adopted certain doctrinal errors. In the first place, they contended, that the true church had absolutely perished, except in those districts of Africa where Donatism was professed; complimenting the catholic church, like our modern sectarists, with the honorable epithet of—*whore of Babylon*. 2. That baptism and the other sacraments, administered out of the true church, that is, out of their own society, were void and of no effect; and, in conformity with this maxim, they rebaptised their proselytes from catholicity. To propagate the sect, every species of seduction was employed: dark insinuations, captious arguments, open violence; the most atrocious cruelty, persecution and imposture—till such lawless methods of proceeding were ultimately suppressed by the just severity of the imperial edicts under Constantine and succeeding emperors.

The Donatists are also designated in ecclesiastial history under the names—of Circumcellions, of Urbanists, Petilianists, &c. &c. either from some characterizing peculiarities, or from the various leaders of the sect who occasionally distinguished themselves. The Circumcellions were likewise denominated Rock-men, Mountaineers, &c. and were chiefly wild and ignorant

country clowns, who, pretending to devote themselves to martyrdom, wandered and roamed up and down the country for a certain time, pampering themselves as victims fed for the sacrifice, and at length precipitated headlong from the rocks, or into rivers, or otherwise put an end to their own existence; which they called martyrdom. Many of them would needs compel travellers whom they happened to fall in with, to murder them. Some catholics who met them in this strange frenzy, to save their own lives, and not imbrue their hands in the blood of these fanatics, insisted first upon their being bound, before they would proceed to make them martyrs; and when they were secured, they beat them soundly till they returned to their senses, and were content to live. (See Theodoret, Hæret. Fab.)

Such are the extravagances into which men are liable to fall, when once they have abandoned the paths of truth, and follow in its stead the guidance of error and their passions. The errors of the sect were combated with success, chiefly by St Optatus of Milevum, and the great St Augustine. The former observes, that *passion was the mother of the schism, ambition the nurse, and avarice the champion in the cause*: and St Augustine remarks in general, on this occasion, that, *all who disturb the peace of the church, do it either blinded by pride, distracted with envy, or seduced by worldly interest, soft passions and unruly lust*. The united efforts of these two great men and most enlightened pastors of the church, had given a mortal blow to the Donatist faction. But it was not totally extinct till after the Vandal conquest of Africa, nor even before the seventh century.

Against these sectaries St Augustine lays down the true principles of the unity, extent and perpetuity of the church. He demonstrates, 1st, the falsehood of that doctrine—that sinners are not members of the church; since Jesus Christ compares the church to a net in which are enclosed all kinds of fish, both good and bad;—to a field in which tares are mixed with the good grain; to a barn-floor on which is found chaff together with the wheat: and he tells us it shall so remain till the last day, when he will separate the good from the bad grain, the chaff from the wheat, &c. The sacraments which he instituted for the reconciliation of sinners, are themselves a striking proof that the latter are within the pale of the church. 2nd. He shows that the Donatists were palpably in error—to suppose that the catholic and universal church could be cooped up in a corner of Africa, confined within the limits of their own sect, and not diffused, more or less, over the whole christian world, as it was in fact at the period in question; the greater part of Europe, Asia, and even Africa itself, being then catholic. 3rd. He shews the absurdity of the idea—that the sacraments were null when administered by prevaricating priests or bishops. For the efficacy of the sacraments depends not upon the interior dispo-

sitions of the person who confers them : it is Jesus Christ himself that baptises and absolves by the organ even of a wicked minister. 4th. St Augustine teaches, that the unity of the church consists in the profession of one and the same faith ; in the participation of the same sacraments ; in submission to its legitimate pastors. This unity, he says, it is never lawful to disturb by schism. And these principles are applicable equally to every age ; they alike condemn all the various sects that ever have relinquished the communion of the catholic church. Nothing but inculpable ignorance can excuse any one that refuses to embrace it.

DOSITHEUS—See SIMON the MAGICIAN.

DUALISTS—a name given to those who maintained, that in the universe there are two eternal and necessary principles ; one of them the efficient cause of all good, the other author of all evil. See the articles MARCION and MANES.

DULCINUS—the disciple of the infamous Segarel, and, after his master's death, himself the leader of the sect called APOSTOLICS. (See the article.)

DUNKERS (or Tunkers)—first appeared about the year 1721, chiefly in Pennsylvania. Their dress resembles that of the Dominican friars : they never shave their beard, have different apartments for the sexes, and live principally on roots and vegetables, except at their love feasts when they eat only mutton. No bed is allowed them but in case of sickness, having in their respective cells a bench to lie upon, and a block of wood for their pillow. Their principal tenet is the mortification of the body ; and they deny the eternity of punishment. They are commonly called the *harmless* Dunkers. This account is given of them in the *Sketch* of Mr Evans. They seem to be ambitious of rivaling in austerity of life—some of the religious orders in the Roman catholic church : it would be well if they copied also their orthodoxy of belief.

As to what regards the eternity of punishment—it is one of those articles which, being incomprehensible to human reason, our faith commands us to receive with an humble submission of our understanding to revealed truth. Here to reason is—to risk our being lost in the unfathomable abyss of the Divine immensity ; and it is our only secure way to follow in this, as in all other doctrines of revelation, the unerring guidance of that church, which Christ himself enjoins us all to *hear*—under pain of being looked upon as heathens or incorrigible sinners. Thus we shall avoid the rash presumption of too curiously prying into the *unsearchable ways* of God. *Incomprehen-*

sible are his judgments ; and who, exclaims the royal psalmist, shall be able to recount the mightiness of thy wrath ! (Ps. 89.)

E

EBIONITES—a word which in Hebrew signifies *poor*, and was appropriated to a sect of men who had adopted the sentiments of the Nazareans, adding certain practices and doctrines peculiar to themselves. For instance, the Nazareans received all the books of the ancient Testament comprised in the canon of the Jews ; while the Ebionites rejected all the prophets ; held in abomination the names of David, of Solomon, of Jeremy and Ezechiel ; and, of all the books of holy scripture, they admitted only the Pentateuch. Origen distinguishes two sorts of Ebionites, and informs us, that some among them held with the Nazareans, that Christ was born of a virgin ; the rest maintained, that he had been brought into the world in the same manner precisely, as were other men. One branch of the Ebionites were strictly temperate and chaste, while another refused to admit into their communion any person unmarried, although not yet arrived at the age of puberty. These moreover practised polygamy, though they scrupled to touch any animal food, or even any thing derived from animals, as milk, eggs, &c. They received, in common with the Nazareans, the gospel according to St Matthew, but in many places adulterated ; and among a variety of other corruptions, they had retrenched the genealogy of Christ, which the Nazareans had retained. Besides the Hebrew gospel of St Matthew, the Ebionites had adopted many other books as scripture under the names of James, John and other apostles, and also the apocryphal voyages of St Peter. (Origen con. Cels. Epiph. Hær. 20. Iren. 1. c. 20. Euseb. Hist. Eccles. l. 3, c. 27.)

ELCESAITES, Osseonians or Sampseans—were a sect of fanatics who jumbled together a few ideas of christianity—with the errors of the Ebionites, the principles of judicial astrology, and the practice of the black art ; the invocation of demons, witchcraft, and the observance of the Jewish ceremonial law. With them, we must not look for consistency or connection. They adored—after all—only one God, and thought they did him mighty honor by plunging into the bath several times in the day : they acknowledged one Christ, one Messiah whom they called the Great King. It is not known whether they held Jesus to be this Messiah, or some other not yet arrived. But they attribut-

ed to him a human form, although invisible, and a stature of about thirty-eight leagues. They concluded, that the Holy Ghost was a female, because the word in Hebrew is of the feminine gender, and for fear they should otherwise be obliged to ascribe two fathers to Jesus Christ.

Under the emperor Trajan a Jew named Elxai embraced their sect, and composed a book of prophecies, which, he assured them, contained wisdom divine. The Elcesaites imagined it had dropped from heaven. Elxai himself was honored by the sect as a Puissance *revealed*, and predicted by the prophets; his name in the Hebrew tongue signifying *revealed*: they revered all his progeny even to adoration, and deemed it a sacred duty to die for them. So low as the reign of Valens two sisters of the race of Elxai, or the blessed race, still survived: their names were Martha and Martenna; and they were worshipped by the Elcesaites as goddesses. When they went abroad they were attended in crouds by these ridiculous enthusiasts, who industriously collected the dust of their feet, and even caught the spittle from their mouth: these precious relics they preserved with religious veneration, and carried them about with them in boxes as sovereign preservatives against misfortune. (Epiph. Hær. 19.)

ENCRATITES. See TATIAN.

EON DE L'ETOILE—was a native of Brittany, and flourished in the twelfth age. At that epoch the Latin word EUM was pronounced EON, and the choir, instead of singing *Per eum qui venturus est judicare vivos et mortuos*, intoned *Per eon qui venturus est judicare vivos et mortuos*. This pronunciation attracted the notice of Eon de l'Etoile; and it struck him very forcibly, that he was himself the identical character alluded to, and that of course he should come again to judge the quick and the dead, and by consequence,—was the Son of God. He publishes this ridiculous conceit; and the silly vulgar gives it full credit; attends him in crouds through divers provinces of France, and marks its progress with the despoliation, both of private property and, particularly, of religious communities. Eon allotted to his disciples their respective rank and dignity. Some were angels; others apostles. One was denominated *Wisdom*; another *Judgment*; a third *Domination* or *Science*; and why not a fourth, as in Cromwell's religious army, *Praise-God-Barebones*? Several puissant lords had repeatedly dispatched a force to apprehend this infatuated enthusiast, but to little purpose. For Eon had the address, by courteous treatment and well timed liberalities, to avert the danger. It was confidently given out and generally credited, that he was a conjurer and a magician; and that it was not in the power of man to seize his person. However, the archbishop of Rheims succeeded in the

desperate attempt; and then, it was supposed the demons had forsaken him. This prélate caused him to appear before the council convoked at Rheims by Eugenius III. against the novel doctrines of Gilbert of Poréa. Eon was declared lunatic, and sent to the asylum. But *Judgment* and *Science*, and some few more of his disciples who remained incorrigible in their folly, were sentenced to the stake. (See d'Argentré Collect. Jud. Natal. Alex. in sæc. 12. Dup. bibliot. douzieme siecle.)

In this ignorant and besotted age, while one part of the people was seduced by Eon de l'Etoile, Peter Bruys, Tanchelin, and a croud of other fanatics propagated their respective errors, and excited the flock against their lawful pastors; and theologians were busily employed in their schools in discussing subtle questions of divinity, and disputed with much asperity on points of trifling significance and metaphysical minutiae. The people, too ignorant to interfere in these scholastic contests, were in other respects very ill instructed in religious knowledge, and ever open to the seduction of the first impostor who thought it worth his while to mislead them; and unfortunately, of characters of this description, in an age of ignorance there is seldom any scarcity.

EPIPHANIUS—See CARPOCRATIANS.

EPISCOPALIANS—an appellation appropriated chiefly to the members of the church of England. They insist much on the divine origin of their bishops, and clerical ordination. Their present doctrines are set forth in thirty-nine articles established in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, and ordinarily to be found in their book of *Common Prayer*; although their sister episcopalian church of America has curtailed the number to twenty. In Scotland, since the revolution in favour of William III. and the house of Brunswick, a large proportion of Episcopalians, and no small number of them even in England, through their firm attachment to the Stuart family, long refused to acknowledge the new settlement, and were denominated *non-jurors*—until the decease of the Pretender whom they stiled Prince Charles, in 1788; when they thought fit to tender their allegiance to the reigning sovereign. Since that period the odious distinction of *non-juror* has been done away.

Of the Episcopalians, or the church of England, the king is recognised as supreme head: there are two archbishops and twenty-four bishops: each prelate has a seat in the house of peers, with the exception only, of the bishop of Sodor and Man. The established church in Ireland is the same with that in England. Four only, out of eighteen bishops and four archbishops, who constitute the protestant prelacy in that kingdom since its union with Great Britain, sit in the house of lords, assembled at Westminster.

Of the conflicts, the vicissitudes and variations of Episcopalianism, we will here say nothing; and shall only beg leave to refer our readers to the articles—LUTHER, the REFORMATION, Ward's Cantos, &c. &c.

The peculiar merits of the church of England above the other reformed churches, a well-known poet accurately discriminates. It is in his ideas—

The least *de*-formed, because *re*-formed the least.

ESCHINISTS—See the article MONTANUS.

EUCHITES, or EUTYCHITES—disciples of Simon Magus, who pretended that the human soul had assumed a material body, for no other end than the gratification of the most infamous voluptuousness. This was the impious conceit of the Antitactæ also, and the Cainites. See their respective articles. (Theodoret, Hær. Fab. l. 5, c. 9.) The MESSALIANS also were termed Euchites. See that article.

EUNOMIANS, called also ANOMIANS—the disciples of Eunomius, a noted Arian bishop, who denied the divinity both of the Son and the Holy Ghost. Baptism he ordered to be conferred—in the name of the Father unbegotten,—of the Son who was begotten,—and of the Holy Ghost, the creature of the second person. He rejected the triple immersion then customary in the church, and caused the head and breast only of the party baptised to be dipped in the font, esteeming the remainder of the body as infamous, and absolutely unworthy of the sacrament. To his other principles he added the very commodious one importing—that those who should faithfully observe his doctrine, were not liable to forfeit grace, whatever guilt they might incur, even that of final impenitence. (Theodoret, Hæret. Fab. l. 4, c. 3. Aug. de Hær. Epiph. Her. 76. Baron. ad ann. 356.) Did then this right reverend of old prognosticate in the spirit—the justification inamissible of Mr Calvin? The sect did not survive the reign of Theodosius II. (Codex Theod. l. 8.)

EUPHRATESIANS—(See PEREANS.)

EUSEBIANS—Arians, so called from Eusebius of Nicomedia, one of the most zealous partisans of Arius. See ARIANS.

EUSTATHIANS—sectarists of the fourth age who, like their master Eustathius, denied salvation to be attainable in any other but the monastic state. In the council of Gangres, held towards the beginning of the fourth century, these sectaries are cen-

sured—1. For condemning matrimony, and encouraging wives to forsake their husbands. 2. For abandoning the churches—to resort to their private conventicles. 3. For engaging servants to quit their masters, and children their parents, under the specious pretence of embracing a more austere method of life. 4. For obliging their followers to renounce all property as incompatible with salvation. 5. For condemning the honor paid to martyrs in the oratories erected to their memory;—with other erroneous doctrines, prescribed and anathematized by the council in twenty canons inserted in Dupin's Collection of the Canons of the universal Church. (See also Fleury, t. 4, l. 17.) What a pity these enthusiasts did not agree with our modern reformers in other articles, as well as that relating to the honor exhibited to martyrs! Had they been so fortunate, they would have figured among the foremost in the protestant calendar of reformers, or among Mr Brewster's presbyterian Culdees.

EUTYCHIANS—followers of Eutyches, who, in the fifth age, pretended that in Jesus Christ there was only one nature. The intemperate zeal of this monk against Nestorianism, hurried him into the opposite extreme; and, for fear of admitting two distinct persons in Christ, he held only one nature or a species of compound—of the Divinity and the humanity combined. He would not allow the body of Jesus Christ to be of the same substance with ours; and, of course, he attributed to the Son of God, with the Valentinians and the Marcionites, only a *fantastic* body. Sometimes, indeed, he seemed to recognise two natures *before* the incarnation, and to suppose, that the soul of our Redeemer was united to the Divinity *previously* to his assuming a human body: but he constantly refused to acknowledge a distinction of the two natures—*after* the incarnation had taken place, pretending that the human nature was absorbed by the divinity, as a drop of honey falling into the sea might be said—not indeed to be annihilated, but to be swallowed up, and no longer distinguishable from the watery element.

In a council held by St Flavian patriarch of Constantinople in 448, this error was condemned. Eutyches appeared before the council attended by two of the principal officers of the court, and a troop of the imperial guards. To all reasoning and authority produced against his novel doctrine, he replied, that he was come thither—not to dispute, but to profess his faith. The council proceeded to separate him from the communion of the faithful; and the sentence was subscribed by thirty-two bishops, and eighteen priests. Eutyches said privately to his guards, that he appealed from their judgment to that of the bishops of Rome, Alexandria and Jerusalem; and by letter endeavoured to impose upon the pope. But his holiness St Leo the Great, being informed of the true state of the affair by St Flavian, wrote to him an ample declaration of the orthodox faith upon the article in

question, which was afterwards read and inserted in the acts of the council of Chalcedon; and in which the errors of Eutyches were solemnly condemned.

The false council of Ephesus commonly called Latrocinale, or the *cabal*, by court intrigue was opened on the eighth of August, in 449. Eutyches was there;—as were also two officers from the emperor, with a band of soldiers. Every thing was carried by violence and open faction in favour of Eutyches; and the pope's legates were not allowed to read his letters to the assembly. By Eutyches's partisans a sentence of deposition was pronounced against St Flavian and Eusebius of Dorylœum. The legates protested against the lawless sentence. Hilarius the deacon cried out aloud, *contradicitur*—importing—*opposition is made*; which Latin word was inserted in the Greek acts of the synod. Several of the bishops, prostrate at the feet of Dioscorus the wicked patriarch of Alexandria, while he was reading up the sentence, besought him in the most submissive terms to proceed no farther in so unwarrantable an affair. He called aloud for the imperial commissioners Elpidius and Eulogius, who instantly set open the church doors; when Proclus, the pro-consul of Asia, rushed in surrounded with a troop of soldiers, and followed by a confused multitude—with chains, clubs and swords. Few or none of the faint-hearted prelates had now the courage to withhold their subscription to the measures of Dioscorus, except the pope's legates, who protested aloud against his violent proceedings. One of them was hurried off to prison; the other (Hilarius) with much difficulty effected his escape, and arrived safe at Rome. Flavian appealed from the unjust sentence pronounced against him, to the holy see; and delivered his appeal in writing to the legates, with his own hand. The impious Dioscorus, and others of his faction, after throwing the holy bishop on the ground, so kicked and bruised him, that he died of his wounds in the course of a few days, in his exile at Ephippus, two days journey from Ephesus. After this, Dioscorus, with two of his Egyptian bishops, had the insolence to excommunicate St Leo. But violence and injustice did not triumph long; and the emperor's eyes being opened to discern the fatal consequences of his own credulity, he disgraced those who had so grossly abused his confidence, and patronised the cause of truth. The wicked Dioscorus was anathematized by the general council of Chalcedon in 451, and died impenitent in the Eutychian heresy and his other crimes, in his banishment at Gangres, in 454. With regard to Eutyches himself, he passed some time in exile, obstinately attached to his erroneous system. History speaks of him no more from the period just mentioned; but his sectaries long survived the exit of their author. The emperor Zeno suffering himself to be seduced by the Eutychians, the three first patriarchates of the

East, in 482 fell a prey to intruders of that sect. Alexandria was occupied by Peter Mongus, Antioch by Peter the Fuller, and Constantinople by Acacius. These men indeed did not exactly coincide with Eutyches, but professed a kind of qualified Eutychianism; teaching that the divine and human nature were so intimately united, as to form in reality but one compound nature, perfectly simple and unconfused! This doctrine, unintelligible and inconsistent as it was, the major part of the Eutychians adopted; and, from this epoch they are generally denominated *Monophysites*; reprobating alike the doctrine of Eutyches, and that of the council of Chalcedon.

Zeno, by the advice of Acacius, with the specious pretence of reconciling all parties, published in the course of the same year, 482, his famous decree of union termed the Henoticon, addressed to the bishops, clergy and people of Egypt and Lybia. As this decree insinuated a charge injurious to the council of Chalcedon, it was universally rejected by the catholics, and condemned by Pope Felix III. in the ensuing year. A party of Monophysites relinquished the communion of their fellow-sectaries, and were termed *Acephali*, or *without a leader*. But it was not long before they found a patron and defender, in the person of Anastasius the emperor. The monk Severus was placed in the patriarchal see of Antioch; and from him the faction took the name of Severians. In 518 Anastasius was succeeded in the empire by Justin, a catholic prince; who exerted himself to the utmost in extinguishing the entire sect of the Monophysites. The latter, notwithstanding, found means not long afterwards to repair with advantage the losses of their party.

A small number of bishops still adhered to it, and placed a monk called Jacob Baradaeus, an ignorant but enterprising bigot to the cause, in the episcopal see of Edessa. This new apostle traversed in his fanaticism the provinces of the East; united the jarring partisans of Eutychianism, animated their drooping spirits, and established among them bishops and a clergy. Thus by his extraordinary exertions in favour of this heresy, it regained its former influence in Syria, Mesopotamia, Armenia; in Egypt, Nubia and Ethiopia. Ever since this epoch, the Monophysites have honored Jacob Baradaeus (alias Zanzala) as their second founder; and from him they derive their name of *Jacobites*. Patronised by the Persians, out of enmity to the Constantinopolitan emperors their persecutors, and afterwards by the Mahometans on the same account, their spread was both rapid and extensive. Before their regeneration, they were divided into ten or twelve discordant branches, and were variously denominated—Caianists, Incorrupticolæ, Aphthartodocetæ, Damianites, Severians, Agnoetæ, Philoponists, &c. from their several enthusiastic leaders, or the circumstances of their disagreement. After the death of Severus, Baradaeus ordained one

Paul bishop of Antioch, from whom a regular series of Jacobite bishops have borne that title to the present period. The patriarchate of Antioch included all Cilicia, the two Phœnicias, Mesopotamia, Isauria, Euphratissia and Osroenia; and in all these provinces the Jacobin party was the most numerous, although the imperial decrees enforced among them—under the severest penalties—the doctrine of the council of Chalcedon. Vast numbers, in consequence, emigrated into Persia and Arabia, where every sect indiscriminately, which had been persecuted by the Roman emperors, found a secure asylum and unlimited toleration. Many who still remained and had subscribed to the articles of the synod, embraced externally the communion of the church, while they inwardly abhorred it, and formed in the very heart of the empire a formidable party of concealed enemies. The Persians took advantage of their disaffection, and broke impetuously into the Roman territories; from which they severed many extensive provinces. The Jacobites on this occasion were patronised by the conquerors; nor were the Saracens less favourable, when they subverted the empire of the Persians. Thus the Jacobites became the triumphant party under these new masters, while the catholics were every where discountenanced and oppressed. The Monophysite patriarch established missions throughout the oriental provinces, and thus perpetuated in those nations the doctrines of his sect. The same causes operated similar effects in Egypt and in Abyssinia. See the articles—**ABYSSINIANS** and **COPHTS**.

The Jacobites however, sometimes had their share of persecution, in common with the professors of christianity in general, even under the Persian and Saracen autocracy; just as the avarice or fanaticism of their despotic masters inclined: and great numbers of both Jacobites and catholics apostatized to Mahometism. In fact, there exists not at this day one single christian family in all Nubia.

The pope had established a patriarch at Antioch, while the princes of the West were in possession of Syria, during which period the Jacobites seemed disposed to a reconciliation with the church of Rome; although it did not actually take place. The Latin patriarchs resided at Antioch till its subjugation by the Mussulmans in the year 1267. At this day there are two patriarchs of Antioch; the one catholic, the other monophysist; each of whom have their respective suffragans. The Jacobites have likewise churches wherever the Nestorians are established; and these two sects, for so many ages at drawn daggers with each other, now fraternize, and seem to have forgot the origin of their former animosity.

The Jacobites acknowledge only one nature in Jesus Christ, reject the council of Chalcedon, and condemn the letter of St Leo; though they do not hold with Eutyches, that the divine and

human nature are confounded in the person of our blessed Redeemer; and are rather to be classed with the Acephali, whose peculiar merit was—violent opposition to the council. They admit all the sacraments of the Roman catholic church, with the variation only of certain practices in the mode of administration. Some have falsely charged them with errors respecting the blessed Trinity, the origin of human souls, and other articles; and though they have precisely the same faith which the council of Chalcedon proposes for their rule, mere prejudice obliges them rather to suffer death than subscribe to its decrees. They are great fasters; and, in the austerity of their fasts they seem to make a great part of the gospel perfection to consist. Many of them have been known, for a long succession of years, to have eaten nothing during Lent, but the leaves of the olive. Some of their monks live in communities; others in deserts, and others again, like certain ancient saints, on the tops of pillars. Their superiors are themselves subordinate to the bishops. Assemanni in his *Oriental Library*, t. 2, has given us a list of their most eminent writers, philosophers and theologians; among whom many have attained to excellence. The sect itself—formerly so numerous, is at the present day, very inconsiderable, except in Abyssinia. See the article **ABYSSINIANS**.

It will not be denied, that in the council of Chalcedon the sessions were attended with some tumult and disorder. But, if the Holy Ghost presided not over its decisions, we should be glad to be informed—how men, infuriated by passion and divided into factions,—all intent upon enforcing their own respective opinions, and devoting their adversaries to damnation, eventually united in condemning the intrigues of party, and in reprobating unanimously the opposite errors of Eutychianism and Nestorianism! In this instance, so clearly recognisable are the influences of the Holy Spirit, that any other reply to the impassioned declamations of Basnage and other enemies of the Chalcedonian synod, would be perfectly superfluous.

The council declares that, conformably to the writings of the holy fathers, it professes a belief in one Jesus Christ our Lord, the Son of God; perfect God* and perfect man; consubstantial with the Father according to the Godhead, and with us men according to the humanity: that in him are two natures—without division, without separation, without change; for as much as the properties of the two natures subsist and harmonize in one and the same person;—who is not divided into two, but is one only Jesus Christ the Son of God, as it is declared in the Nicene creed.—This formula was approved unanimously by the whole council; in which the church taught—against Nestorius, that in Jesus Christ there was but one person; and—against Eutyches, that in the same divine person were united two distinct natures.

F

FAMILISTS OR FAMILY OF LOVE—the name of a sect which pretended that perfection and religion consisted in charity alone, independently of faith and hope, which they considered as imperfections. This charity, according to them, exalted men above the laws and rendered them incapable of sinning. One Henry Nicolas of Munster was author of the sect. At first he modestly assumed the character of prophet, but soon proclaimed himself to be a person deified. Nor would this suffice; he deemed himself a greater personage than Jesus Christ who, he said, was nothing more than a type or figure of himself. About the year 1540, he attempted to seduce the famous Theodore Volkart, with whom he had many unsuccessful interviews. When Theodore's arguments were like to prove too strong, he appealed to the Spirit which, he said, commanded him to hold his peace. The enthusiast, notwithstanding, made many silly proselytes, who all like their master were willing to be accounted of divine origin.

Henry composed some books; for instance—those entitled *The Gospel of the Kingdom*, *The Land of Peace*, &c. The sect was admitted into our Island of Saints towards the commencement of the seventeenth century, and in 1604 presented to King James a Confession of Faith, in which they declare they do not hold communion with the Brownists, and profess a readiness to obey the magistracy whatever may be their religious principles. George Fox, himself the very fanatic author of Quakerism, inveighed aloud against this *Family of Love*, and complimented them with the title of *Fanatics*; because, said he, they did not scruple to take oaths, to dance, to sing, and to be merry. Serious charges these, and very scandalous to their rivals in fanaticism at the present day!

FELIX of URGEL. See **ADOPTIONISTS.**

FIFTH-MONARCHY-MEN—a turbulent sect in the days of Oliver Cromwell. They pretended, that Jesus Christ was on the point of establishing upon earth a *fifth monarchy*, alluded to by the prophet Daniel; and, with this persuasion, they resolved to overturn the existing government, and to substitute in lieu of it absolute anarchy. (Mosheim, *Eccles. Hist.*) A striking instance, among so many others equally extravagant—of the dangerous fanaticism produced in England by the unrestricted liberty of reading and interpreting Holy Scripture according to each one's fancy or private spirit.

FLAGELLANTS—a name given to a kind of penitentialists who pretended, that self-discipline or flagellation remitted sin—equally with baptism. The sect originated in 1260, from one Reinerius at Perusia. This man undertook to preach up penance to the people, and taught them with that view—to use the discipline. In 1349, on occasion of the black pestilence which had desolated Europe, the sect was propagated through Poland, Germany, France, Italy and England. They had crosses in their hands and a cowl upon their head, and went naked to the waist; lashed themselves publicly twice a-day, and once in the night—with knotted cords stuck with the points of pins; and then fell prostrate on the ground, imploring aloud the Divine Mercy. From this singularity which, doubtless, at first proceeded from a true spirit of penitence, they fell into a gross heresy, affirming that their blood—united with that of Christ in such a manner, as to have the same efficacy; that after thirty days whipping, they were acquitted from the guilt and punishment of sin, and needed not the sacraments; persuading the deluded multitude that the gospel had ceased;—with other similar impieties. This phrensy continued a long time, notwithstanding the censures of the church, and the edicts of christian princes for its suppression.

In Italy, Spain and Germany, there still exist certain confraternities, in which the *discipline* is used as an instrument of penance, but which bear no resemblance in any other respect, with the sectaries just mentioned. When this practice is adopted purely through a sincere regret for having offended Almighty God, and with the desire of appeasing the divine justice, beyond all doubt it is innocent, and, in due circumstances, even commendable: but if performed in public, there is great danger of its degenerating into bare ceremony and hypocrisy, instead of contributing in any degree to the reformation of morals.

FRATRICELLI, or FREROTS—names given indiscriminately to a multitude of sects which inundated Europe in the thirteenth century. These sects fell into the most horrid disorders; renewed the infamies of the Gnostics and the Adamites; pretended that neither Christ himself nor his apostles had observed continence; and that they all had wives of their own, or, what is still more blasphemous, those of other people. Some of these fanatics were not ashamed to maintain, that incest and adultery were no crimes when perpetrated by their fellow sectaries. The greater part, extremely ignorant, imagined the whole perfection of a christian to consist in a state of absolute poverty and mendicity; the profession of which was the distinctive character of the sect. Their original authors were certain refractory Franciscans, who, with the specious plea of practising more perfectly the religious institutes of St Francis, separated from their brethren, and lived an idle vagabond life. John XXII. repro-

bated their pretensions, and fulminated a sentence of excommunication against themselves and their abettors. In revenge, they spurned the pope's authority, and leagued themselves with those princes who happened to be at variance with the spiritual head of the church. On this account, we suppose, have protestants been induced to adopt these wretched libertines as the predecessors of their reformation. Nor do catholics envy them the honour.

FREROTS—See the above article, FRATRICELLI.

G

GNOSIMACHI—Sectaries of the seventh age, who reprobated every kind of useful research after knowledge and the sciences, even to the study of the holy scriptures; because, said they, God requires virtuous *actions* in the faithful, and not science. This conceit was renewed by the Abecedarians. See their article.

GNOSTICS, or the ILLUMINED—were an impious sect of the first or second age, divided into various branches; some of which were denominated from their respective authors, *Simonians*, *Valentinians*, *Basilidians*, *Carpocratians*, *Sethians*, *Nicolaites*, *Ophites*, &c. &c. To these sectarists, St Paul seems to allude in different parts of his epistles. (See, for instance, 1 Tim. c. 6, v. 20.) They believed in two first principles; the one good and the principle of good; the other bad, and the author of evil. They held the human soul to be the very substance of the Divinity; while they denied Christ to be God, although they acknowledged that the Divinity resided in him. They justified the most criminal excesses, and practised them without a blush; defiling their nocturnal assemblies with every species of obscene gratification.

GODESCALCUS—See PREDESTINARIANISM.

GOMARISTS—See ARMINIANS.

GREEK CHURCH—consists of those christians who still adhere to the schism first commenced by the ambitious patriarch of Constantinople, Photius; and afterwards renewed in 1053 by the no less ambitious Cerularius, one of his successors in that patriarchate, on pretences equally frivolous and capricious.

Cerularius, and Leo Bishop of Acrida, wrote a joint letter to John bishop of Trani in Apulia, in which they objected against the catholics of the Western or Latin church,—that they celebrated the holy eucharist in *unleavened* bread; fasted on the Saturdays in Lent; scrupled not to eat blood; omitted the *Alleluias* during the Lenten term; and other trivial points of discipline. (See Cerularius's letter, and Sigeb. de Script. c. 349.) Malice must be to the last degree extravagant, to ground a schism and defection from the catholic communion, upon such trifling exceptions! St Leo IX. who then sate in St Peter's chair, answered by an exhortation to peace; alleging for these practices of discipline the ancient law and tradition from St Peter, especially for the use of unleavened bread in the eucharist. He dispatched a legate to Constantinople, with a learned and ample apology, composed by himself against the exceptions of the Greeks, in order to preserve them in union with the Latin church; but was not able to overcome the obstinacy of Cerularius, whose influence and intrigues drew the greater part of the Oriental churches into his schism; in which, barring some short intervals of re-union, they have continued to the present day. Cerularius himself having also, by his factious spirit, embroiled the state, was driven into exile; and closed a criminal and restless life in misery and despair. (See Baronius, Curopallat. Psellus. Zonar. &c.)

The Greek church professes, with the exception only of the spiritual supremacy of the pope, and the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son,—all the articles of faith maintained by the Latin or the Roman church. (See Petri Arcudii Concordia Eccles. Oriental. et Occidental. Allatius, de Eccles. Occidental. et Oriental. perpetuâ consensione. Censura Oriental. Eccles. de præcipuis nostri sæculi hæreticorum dogmatibus. Perpet. de la Foi, t. 3, l. 9. Ricot. Hist. of the present state of the Greek church, c. 3, p. 91, &c.)

Some protestant theologists of the seventeenth century scrupled not to affirm, that the Greeks exactly coincided in sentiment with themselves in regard of the divers points of controversy between protestants and catholics. The learned authors of the work entitled *La Perpetuité de la Foi de l'Eglise Catholique touchant l'Eucharistie*, 5 vol. in-4to, have with much diligence and fidelity collected the various monuments ascertaining the religious creed of the Greek church. Such are, for instance, in the first place—the testimony of the different authors of that communion, who have flourished since the ninth century, when the schism first commenced; secondly,—the professions of faith of many bishops, metropolitans and patriarchs;—the definitions of two or three synods held expressly for the purpose, and the attestations of several Russian prelates:—and in the third place—the liturgies, euchologies and other ecclesiastic records of the

Greeks. By all these authentic documents they have triumphantly demonstrated, that in every age, as at the present day, the Greeks have constantly admitted with the church of Rome—seven sacraments, and ascribed to them the same efficacy of conferring grace to the worthy receiver; that they maintain the real presence in the most blessed sacrament; transubstantiation—not consubstantiation, as some have erroneously asserted; and the sacrifice of the mass: that they practise the invocation of saints; honor their relics, and their images; approve the custom of praying for the dead; observe religious vows, &c. This fact amounts to an unquestionable proof, that the articles of religious dispute between the protestants and Roman catholics, have not originated in the latter ages, as they affect to believe; since these very doctrines are professed and maintained by the Greeks their inveterate enemies; whose rancorous animosity, most certainly, would never have permitted them to borrow from the Latin church—any part of their system of belief. The realization of such an hypothesis would be attended with equal difficulty, as would their total reconciliation; nor have they been ever known to sacrifice the most trivial point of difference to promote the cause of peace, and christian charity. The unanimity of these and other ancient schismatics in condemning the protestant doctrines, evinces this truth;—that the tenets of their respective religions which at this present time so strikingly accord with those of the church of Rome, were the genuine doctrines of the universal church twelve hundred years ago;—a prescription, one would imagine, more than sufficient to command the respect of every thinking christian.

With regard to the contested doctrine of the papal supremacy, we must beg leave to observe—that the church is a society; that she has her peculiar laws and form of worship, and regular discipline; her ministers to teach them, and to enforce their execution; a tribunal to determine all disputes concerning faith, morality and discipline. Such is the church established by Jesus Christ; and every such society must have a head. In fact, Jesus Christ, in constituting his church, actually did appoint St Peter and his successors the spiritual heads of all the faithful. This is a truth avowed by the fathers and by the councils of every age; and the universal voice of catholic tradition proclaims it. Holy scripture informs us, that our Divine Redeemer gave this pre-eminence to Peter with respect to the rest of the apostles; as most evidently appears from Matt. xvi. 18, 19, where in reward of his faith and confession he confirmed to him the name of Peter, which signifies a *Rock*; and promised that *upon this rock* he would *build his church*, and that *the gates of hell* should *not prevail against it*; and, moreover, that he would give to him *the keys of the kingdom of heaven*, &c. And again—from St John xxi. 15, &c. where our Lord, after having

asked St Peter—*dost thou love me more than these?* thrice committed to him the charge of all his lambs and sheep, without exception; that is, the special care of his whole church. Hence St Matthew (chap. x. 2) giving the names of the twelve apostles, says—*The first, Simon who is called Peter.* On no other account could he with propriety be styled *the first* of the sacred college, but solely by reason of his supremacy: for, that he was first in age, does not appear; and that he was first in *calling*, is not true; since St Andrew came to Christ before Peter, and was probably the elder brother. Certain it is, that the evangelists in reckoning up the names of the apostles upon several occasions, neither follow the order of their age, nor of their calling; nevertheless, they always place Peter the first on the list, and sometimes, the more plainly to intimate his pre-eminence, name him alone, as chief or prince over all his fellow-apostles. It is said, for instance, in St Mark, (i. 36)—*Simon, and they that were with him*; in St Luke (ix. 32)—*Peter, and they that were with him*; in the Acts (ii. 14)—*Peter standing—with the eleven*; and again (v. 29)—*Peter, and the apostles answered and said, &c.* Here the protestant translation has substituted other apostles; the former expression too clearly denoting St Peter's being something more than the rest. In this place it may not be impertinent to remark,—that our Lord was pleased to instruct the people out of *Peter's* ship (St Luke, v. 3);—that he ordered the same tribute to be paid for Peter, as for himself, (Matt. xvii. 27);—that he prayed for Peter in particular, that his faith might not fail; and ordered him to *confirm*, or strengthen his brethren. (Luke xxii. 32, &c.)

Hence St Peter's supremacy has been ever acknowledged by the unanimous suffrage of the holy fathers. (See Origen—on the 6th chapter to the *Romans*, and in his 5th homily upon *Exodus*; St Basil—*of the judgment of God*, T. 2, P. 402; St Cyril of Jerusalem in his 2d Catechesis; St Epiphanius, Hær. 51. § 17, &c.; St John Chrysostom—in his 2d homily on the 50th psalm, &c.; St Cyril of Alexandria—in his 12th book of St John; St Asterius bishop of Amasea—in his sermon upon SS. Peter and Paul; and, among the Latins, St Cyprian Ep. 70th to Januarius; St Optatus of Milevis, L. 2; 3; St Ambrose, L. 10, upon St Luke; St Jerome—in his first book against Jovinian; St Augustine, L. 2, de Baptismo, c. 1; St Leo, Ep. 85 to Anastasius; St Gregory the Great, L. 4, Ep. 32, &c. &c.) Now as Christ established his church to remain till the end of the world; (Matt. xxviii. 20) so, most certainly, he designed that the form of government which he established in this church, should remain to the end of time. Hence it cannot be questioned but that our blessed Lord intended, that the supremacy which he originally appointed for the better government of his church, and the preservation of unity, should not die with *Peter*—any

more than the church itself, with which he promised to remain for ever; but that it should descend after Peter's decease, to his successors. For, in proportion as the danger of schism in succeeding ages must of course increase, the greater must be the necessity of *one Head* in order to preserve all in one faith and in one communion. Nor did the church ever acknowledge any other for her chief pastor than the bishop of Rome; and no other does, or ever did, put in a claim to the spiritual supremacy, in quality of successor to St Peter. Even the Greeks themselves—down to the period of their first separation from the Latin church, respected his authority; and ecclesiastic history is full of instances, in which the primacy of the pope was exercised even over the church of Constantinople. St Gregory expressly affirms, that both the emperor, and the bishop of that see, always recognised the superiority of the Roman church, (Ep. p. 941.) The patriarchates of Antioch, Alexandria and Jerusalem acknowledged also—the papal jurisdiction; as facts of uncontested notoriety prove to demonstration. When Cerularius renounced the communion of the Western church, all his efforts to engage Peter of Antioch in his schism were ineffectual; and he constantly maintained against that schismatical patriarch—the primacy of the Roman chair. Nor was Africa a stranger to this doctrine; of which the history of the Donatists and the Pelagians affords innumerable proofs. At the commencement of the reforming era—the supremacy of the pope was universally admitted. Huss himself appealed from the sentence of his own pastor the archbishop of Prague, to the see apostolic of Rome; and Luther at first thought fit to disavow the charge of disaffection to the papal authority. “I cast myself,” says he to Leo X. “at your holiness's feet, resolved as I am to obey Jesus Christ who speaks by your mouth.” (Op. Tom. 5, p. 10.) He entreats the pope to listen to him as to a sheep committed to his charge; protests, that he acknowledges the supremacy of the Roman church; and allows, that in every age the popes have held the first rank among her pastors, (ibid. p. 285, T. 2, p. 1.) Melancthon too, was for leaving to the pope his spiritual authority, and was of opinion it might be of service to religion. The learned protestant writer Grotius declares, that the bishop of Rome *has a right* to preside over the universal church; and does away the objection, that the pope may possibly make an ill use of his prerogative—by observing, that in such case, when his mandates are in opposition to the canons, they must not be obeyed; but that, notwithstanding, his authority ought not to be denied, nor obedience to be withholden, when his commands are just: “Had due attention,” continues he, “been given to this maxim, we should at this moment have had a church both united and *reformed*.” The clergy of France, and all its universities, maintained the same opinion; neither admitting infallibility in the

pope nor any power inherent in him, over the temporalities of princes.

The superiority then of the Roman pontiff, is a superiority of honor and jurisdiction : it is his province to cause the canons of the church to be duly observed throughout the christian world ; to assemble synods, and excommunicate the refractory. His decisions, though not infallible, are of great weight, and ought to be respected. He can devise and propose to the church new laws ; but they are not generally binding, independently of the general acceptation of the church. This primacy is of Divine right ; and the Gallican clergy also maintained the bishop of Rome to be metropolitan and patriarch of his own diocese ; and to have particular prerogatives, and a temporal power over what is called the ecclesiastic state,—though not of Divine right, but only by right of acquisition. They held him, likewise, to be inferior to a general council, and liable to deposition by its superior authority ; and that the pope could neither absolve a subject from his allegiance to the king, nor even depose bishops in virtue of his primary jurisdiction. The Transalpine divines have different ideas of the papal supremacy ; but their pretensions have nothing to do with faith.

In answer to the objection against the use of unleavened bread in the eucharist, we will just remark, that it was the constant opinion of all the ancient fathers, that our Lord himself had used it in the institution of this divine sacrament ; and that its use was general in the Western church before the times of Photius. Nor do we find any thing in holy scripture, in tradition, or in the sacred liturgies, which tends to reprobate this practice. It would appear, that the fathers had adopted it—after the example of our Blessed Redeemer, and for greater uniformity ; and that, on the contrary, the Greeks had preferred leavened bread,—not to seem too much attached to a practice which had originated from an ordinance of the Jewish law. Both the one and the other proceeded in this point upon warrantable grounds ; nor could their varying in matters of discipline only, justify a schismatical division.—The controversy concerning the procession of the Holy Ghost will be discussed under the article MACEDONIUS.

H

HELVIDIUS—was an Arian who wrote a book against the perpetual virginity of the mother of God ; his followers were termed Antidicomarianites. (See this article.) He was so profoundly

learned as not to know, that in the scripture style *cousins* are denominated *brethren*. (Hieron. cont. Helvid. Aug. Hær. 84. Epiph. Hær. 78.)

HENRY of BRUYS—was by profession a hermit who, about the commencement of the eleventh age, adopted many of the errors of his master *Peter of Bruys*. (See the article.) He denied with the latter the utility of infant baptism, condemned the use of churches and oratories, and rejected the mass, together with the practice of praying for the dead, &c. An affected singularity and austerity of life obtained for Henry the reputation of a saint. He was young; wore his hair and beard short; went barefoot even in the severest seasons; was tall of stature, and ill clad; his eyes and countenance were wild as the aspect of a stormy ocean, and his voice terrific as the thunder. His rest he ordinarily took on the top of some eminence in the open air, and passed the day in the public resorts of the lower classes. The female part of his admirers affirmed, that he was gifted with the spirit of prophecy, and knew the secrets of their consciences, and their most hidden sins. Henry was now solicited to favor with his presence the diocese of Mans; whither he dispatched two of his disciples who were received with the veneration due to angels. Henry afterwards repaired thither in person; obtained surreptitiously leave to preach; and the clergy themselves exhorted the people to attend his sermons.

The hermit was endowed with a surprising natural eloquence; and he soon convinced the populace that he was an apostolic man. He then began boldly to inculcate his erroneous and equally seditious doctrines. Widely different was the effect of his discourses from what had been expected: the people were incited to acts of violence against the clergy, and were taught to treat them as excommunicated persons: they threatened to pull down their houses, to rifle their property, and to stone or hang their persons. Some were actually dragged in the mire, and beaten in the most outrageous manner. In the absence of the bishop of Mans, who was then at Rome, the chapter proceeded to excommunicate the new evangelist: the sentence was received with insult; and Henry continued his seditious harangues. Meanwhile, the pious and enlightened bishop Hildebert returning, caused the hermit to appear before the people; put some questions to him to expose his ignorance, and then forbade him to preach, with an order that he should quit his diocese. Henry left Mans accordingly; and travelling through Languedoc and Provence, collected there some few disciples. Pope Eugenius III. dispatched a legate into those provinces; and St Bernard also repaired thither, in order to preserve the faithful from the multifarious errors and fanaticism which desolated that part of France. Henry took to flight, but was arrested in his retreat,

and confined for life in close custody at Toulouse. His followers dispersed themselves over the southern provinces of France, mixed with the Albigenses, and were annihilated together with them. Thus terminated the pretended perpetuity of the protestant system of religion—of those enlightened times; and such was the end of another of Mr Basnage's famed patriarchs of the reformation. (*Hist. des Egl. Ref. t. 1, Period 4, c. 6, p. 145.* See PETER OF BRUYS.) To his other claims of veneration from protestants, let it be added, that Henry of Bruys was convicted of adultery and other grievous crimes; and that he was ordinarily attended by crowds of profligate women, to whom he preached up the most execrable immorality. These he persuaded to atone for past sins by public immodesties in the church, &c. (*Acta. Episcop. Cenonlan. in Vita Hildeberti.*) Mosheim, who quotes these acts, has not thought fit to repel the imputation.

HERACLEONITES—sectarists of the second age, and a branch of Valentinians. Their author was one Heracleon, who appeared about the year 140, and disseminated his erroneous principles chiefly in Sicily. St Epiphanius tells us, (*Hær. 36*) that to the reveries of Valentinus, Heracleon had superadded his own visionary conceits. He admitted two worlds; the one visible and corporeal, the other spiritual and invisible. The last of which only, according to him, was the work of the Divine Word. He labored hard to justify his system by forced and allegorical explications of Holy Scripture, unwarranted either by reason or tradition. Thus did he impose upon the credulity of many, and form the sect denominated from him Heracleonites. His commentaries on the gospels of St John, and of St Luke, were refuted by the famous Origen, and are full of allegories—destitute alike of probability and good sense; always arbitrary, and frequently ridiculous. (*Philostorg. de Hær. c. 41. Autor. Append. apud Tert. 4. 49. Aug. de Hær. c. 16. Epiph. Hær. 36. Grabe Spicileg. secundi sæc. p. 80.*)

HERMIANS—the followers of one Hermias who flourished in the second age, and adopted the sentiments of Hermogenes. He held the eternity of matter; that God was the soul of the universe, and that consequently he was incumbered with a material body, agreeably to the opinion of the Stoics. Jesus Christ, he said, rising again from the dead had not taken with him into heaven his sacred body, but had repositied it in the sun whence he had originally assumed it. The soul of man, according to the ideas of this new doctor, is composed of elementary fire and subtil air; the birth of children he identifies with the resurrection, and this world he ridiculously supposes to be hell. Thus did Hermias attempt to adulterate the doctrines of chris-

tianity, in order to make them tally with the system of the Stoics; which, beyond all doubt, neither he nor other philosophers of the second age would have deemed worth while, had they esteemed the christian religion, as our modern infidels affect to do,—one continued series of chicanery and imposture. (Vide Philastrium, de Hær. c. 55, 56. Tillemont, t. 3, p. 67, &c. See also the ensuing article.)

HERMOGENIANS—received their tenets and their name from Hermogenes, who after having applied himself to the Stoic philosophy, embraced the christian religion; but without abandoning his former erroneous notions.

The Stoic philosophers admitted a Supreme Being, infinitely perfect. This Being they supposed to be what they termed the *soul* of the universe, intermingled and confounded with matter, imprisoned as it were in a vast variety of bodies, and subject to the blind impetuosity of the elements. While the christians, on the contrary, held an eternal and self-existing principle, sovereignly perfect and uncompounded with matter; which by a simple act of its own will, had brought all things into being; had commanded every thing that now exists to come forth out of nothing, and was instantly obeyed.

The principal error retained by Hermogenes after his conversion to christianity, was—with the Stoics to suppose matter to be eternal and increated, the more easily to account for the origin of evil. He rested his system on the false hypothesis—that evil is a substance, or an absolute entity; and, to render it more plausible, he endeavoured to persuade his followers, that Moses himself, like the Stoic sages, had taught the eternity of matter. Tertullian wrote a book against Hermogenes, in which he combats his adversary's arguments with great energy and success. If, says he, matter be eternal and increated, it is equal with God himself; like him it is a necessary Being, and independent of all others. God is sovereignly perfect, precisely because he is a necessary principle; self-existent, eternal, and, consequently, immutable. It is therefore an absurdity to suppose matter to be—eternal, yet pregnant with evil;—necessary, yet limited and imperfect. With just as much consistency might it be said, that God himself, although a necessary and self-existing principle, is imperfect, limited and feeble. Secondly, it is alike absurd to say, that matter is an eternal and necessary entity, but that its attributes are not so; and that God could alter its state, and give to it a different arrangement from what it had originally. For, eternity or necessary existence implies immutability, and is incompatible with any change. Tertullian also proves, that an eternal and increated being, such as Hermogenes will have matter to be, cannot be essentially evil; consequently, the hypothesis of the eternity of

matter, would not account for the origin of evil—the grand object which Hermogenes, in maintaining the co-eternity of matter, had in view.

HESYCASTES, that is to say, QUIETISTS—were pretended contemplatives among the Greeks, originating with their monks in the eleventh century. In the fervour of their meditation they imagined themselves in ecstasy, and fancied that they beheld a heavenly light, which they took to be an emanation from the Divine substance, and the very same with that which the apostles had beheld on occasion of our Blessed Redeemer's transfiguration upon Mount Thabor.

This ridiculous conceit was renewed with greater zeal in the fourteenth century, especially at Constantinople; where it excited much disquisition, occasioned synodical convocations of bishops, produced ecclesiastical censures, and a variety of treatises written *pro* and *con* by the contending parties.

From this silly fanaticism of the Grecian monks, many protestants have taken occasion to declaim against the contemplative life. But a paroxysm of folly in the mystics of Mount Athos, demonstrates only the weakness of their own brain. Certainly, a person may acquire a habit of meditating upon holy things, without forfeiting the use of reason; and one may be a fool, without the gift of contemplation. The church in approving the religious institute of monks and nuns, does not approve fanaticism or superstition.

HETERODOX, OR DIFFERING IN OPINION—is an epithet equally applicable to false doctrines and false teachers in matters of religion. A false teacher is one, who disseminates and maintains sentiments not according with the truths which God hath revealed. In a religion of which the Divinity himself is the author, we cannot be at variance with revelation—without falling into error. Revelation, notwithstanding, is not witness in its own cause; nor does Almighty God any longer make known to us immediately and personally, what he requires us to believe. What then is the medium through which we are to attain the perfect certitude of any doctrine being revealed? This in effect, is the principal and fundamental point, in which catholics and protestants are at issue with each other. The latter, with some semblance of plausibility, maintain that holy scripture is the medium by which Almighty God has been pleased to instruct us concerning revelation; that whoever believes holy scripture, which is the word of God, believes in fact—all that God has revealed; and that, consequently, he cannot be guilty of heterodoxy, or of culpable error. Catholics on the other hand, contend, that holy scripture, which they equally believe to be the word of God, cannot possibly be the organ of

revelation to *all*. In fact, this divine book does not actually go in quest of infidels who are utter strangers to it; it neither instructs, nor so much as speaks to those that cannot read. Let us make the supposition—that an infidel by some lucky rencounter, lights upon a bible translated into his own language; whence must he derive his conviction of its being the word of God; that whatever is contained in this book is true, and that he is bound to believe it with divine faith? If he is so persuaded, it is because some missionary has assured him of it; in which case his faith rests upon the word of the missionary, and not upon the written word of God. From the times of the apostles down to the present day, there is no instance of a single infidel being brought to the faith—solely by reading the holy scripture. Hence, St Paul affirms, that faith comes not by reading, but *by the hearing: fides ex auditu*.

From the above præmissæ catholics conclude, that the mean established by Almighty God—of coming to the knowledge of what he has revealed, is the testimony of his church, or the constant and uniform instruction of pastors divinely commissioned, and whose mission is authentic and incontestible. Such, in fact, is the method by which Almighty God has enlightened and converted all those infidel nations that have at any time embraced the christian religion. Hence again, they infer, that whatever dogma is contrary to what this church teaches and maintains—is *heterodox*, and an error which excludes its authors and abettors from all rational hope of salvation. Common sense, I think, must give the verdict in favour of the catholic system, however prejudice and the bigotry of education may incline another way.

HUSSITES—followers of John Huss, and of Jerome of Prague. They were both condemned to the stake, and executed at Constance for their seditious opinions, in 1415. Huss, deeply tainted with the doctrines of Wicklef, taught that the church consisted exclusively, of the just and predestinate; reprobates and sinners, according to him, making no part of this society. Hence he concluded, that a bad pope, for instance, was no longer the vicar of Jesus Christ; that bishops and priests living in the state of sin, forfeited of course, all claim to jurisdiction and ministerial power. This doctrine he extends even to the persons of civil magistrates and princès: those that are vicious and govern ill, he says, are ipso facto stript of all authority. Vast numbers adopted his sentiments in Bohemia and Moravia.

The consequences of such pernicious tenets are obvious. The moment any subject establishes himself judge of the conduct of his superiors as well spiritual as temporal, and that it appears to him exceptionable, he has nothing to do but rise in arms to effect their extirpation.

Thus did this pretender to reform, under the specious plea of opposing the abuses to which the authority of the Roman pontiffs, sometimes carried to excess, gave occasion,—aim a mortal blow at the very vitals of all subordination in church and state. He held that christians were not obliged to obey their prelates, but when their orders appeared to themselves reasonable and just; that their rule of faith was scripture alone; with other doctrinal innovations since adopted by the protestants. From the censures of the archbishop of Prague, and of the pope, he appealed to the general council of Constance; to which the king of Bohemia commanded him to give an account of his doctrine, after first obtaining for him of the emperor Sigismund—a promise of a free and safe passage through his dominions on his way to Constance, as well as on his return from the council; provided he should be there found orthodox, or retract his errors. Huss, on the contrary, obstinately refused to obey the council, and continued openly to disseminate his seditious principles. For this treasonable and inflammatory conduct he was—by the civil magistrate of Constance and not by the council—sentenced to the flames. Neither the emperor nor the council on this occasion did any thing inconsistent with good faith. The council condemned his errors and left to the emperor the part of inflicting on the criminal the punishment awarded by the law; and the emperor did no more than avenge his own cause and that of every crowned head, in directing him to be legally punished when found guilty and pertinacious in his treasonable maxims. This is a right inalienable in all sovereigns, and it is an absurdity to imagine, that Sigismund ever had the most distant idea of despoiling himself of it.

Mosheim, the great advocate and admirer of John Huss, himself acknowledges, that the declaration which he made against the infallibility of the catholic church, was sufficient to entitle him to the epithet of false teacher. Was then the catholic church to alter its belief, in order with consistency to *absolve* a person of that description? Mosheim again, allows (Hist. Eccles.) that the Hussites of Bohemia *rebelled* against the emperor Sigismund—after he became their lawful sovereign; and chose to take up arms rather than submit to the decrees of the council of Constance; pretending that Huss had been condemned unjustly. Was it then in character for an ignorant banditti, as they certainly were, to undertake to decide as judges—what was orthodox doctrine and what not? They did not long agree even among themselves; and soon formed two independent parties; the one denominated *Calixtins*—because they insisted upon being allowed the privilege of the chalice at communion; requiring, moreover, that the clergy should imitate the conduct of the apostles, and that mortal sins should be punished in a

manner apportioned to their enormity: the other party was called *Thaborites* from a mountain in the vicinity of Prague, which they fortified, and to which they gave the name of *Thabor*: these were more fanatic than the former, and carried their pretensions still farther. Primitive simplicity, the abolition of the papal authority, the absolute change of the form of worship, and the conceit of having none to preside over their society but Jesus Christ in person, who, they said, was about personally to revisit the earth, with a flambeau in one hand, and a sword in the other, in order to extirpate heresy and to purify his church. To this class of Hussites, exclusively, Mosheim wishes to ascribe all the acts of cruelty and barbarity committed in Bohemia during the course of a bloody war which lasted sixteen years: but, he observes, it is difficult to decide whether the Hussites or the catholics pushed their excesses to greater lengths.—Let us suppose it, for a moment. The Hussites, at least, were the aggressors: they did not await the martyrdom of John Huss, before they exercised their outrages upon the catholics; and, though there might exist abuses in the church, a troop of ignorant fanatics, surely, were not the fittest instruments to reform them. Mosheim admits, that their maxims were *abominable*, and that from such men it was not natural to expect any thing—save acts of cruelty and injustice.

In the year 1433, the fathers of the council of Basil succeeded in reconciling the Calixtins to the catholic church, and indulged them in the use of the cup at the sacred communion. The Thaborites, on the contrary, remained incorrigible; though Mosheim tells us that, on this occasion for the first time, they began to examine into the grounds of their religion, and to give to it a reasonable form. It was indeed high time they should do so, after sixteen years of blood and carnage. These reformed sectarians of John Huss, now took the name of *Brethren of Bohemia*, and were also called *Picards* or rather *Begards*: they espoused the cause of Luther when he commenced reformer, and were his precursors before they became his disciples. Hence we may account for that partiality which protestants have always shown in favor of the Hussites. Of this so glorious an alliance catholics do not envy them the honor.—1. It is granted by the protestants, that these their fellow brethren in Christ were influenced—not by their zeal for religion, but by a blind and furious fanaticism; since they never thought of any plan of worship before the lapse of sixteen years at least, after the death of their proto-martyr Huss! 2. Mosheim has not condescended to inform the world, in what consisted that pretended *reasonable* religion, which so naturally formed a coalition with protestantism. Indeed, that a religion—orthodox in its principles and rational in its creed—should have been the work

of a frantic and infuriated rabble, is somewhat paradoxical. Luther himself had sucked in from the writings of Wicklef and John Huss, not only his heterodox opinions, but also those sanguinary maxims which disgrace his own writings, and renewed in Germany, through the instrumentality of the Anabaptists, a part of the horrid scenes of blood and devastation, of which the Hussites had already set the example in Bohemia.

I & J

JACOBITES. See the article EUTYCHIANS.

ICONOCLASTS, or IMAGE-BREAKERS—enemies to the catholic practice of venerating holy images. The catholic church then maintains—that “*sovereign or divine honour is due to God alone, and cannot be given to any creature without sacrilege and gross idolatry: much less to images or relics which, our catechism admonishes us from our infancy, can neither see, nor hear, nor help us.* But as protestants *do reverence to the name of Jesus in compliance with what their church enjoins, and bow to the altar,* (see Archbishop Laud’s speech in the Star Chamber, June 14, 1637)—without giving divine worship either to the *sound* or to the *wood* (the action of *bowing* being of itself indifferent, and not always an indication of *divine* excellency in the thing or person towards whom it is used); so we believe, that christians have the liberty of using such actions, as are not by the gospel appropriated solely to God, in respect of the images of Christ and his saints,—without giving *divine worship* to any thing save to God the Father, Son and Holy Ghost. For *where there is no law, there is no transgression.* (Rom. iv. v. 15.) *Bowing* and *kneeling* are not actions appropriated by the gospel, exclusively, to God alone. They are among the *ὑποτάξεις*, and are marks of an *inferior* respect;—in a child, for instance, receiving in that humble posture the blessing of his parents;—in the people craving the benediction of the priest;—in a subject attending to the commands of his prince. The use of *incense* in public assemblies, having nothing in itself derogatory from the purposes of religion, and seemingly very congruous with *Malach. i. v. 11*, and neither strictly commanded nor prohibited to christians, cannot be thought appropriated by the gospel solely to Almighty God; but is as indifferent an action as *bowing*. Nor has any person been found ever yet so silly as to imagine, that in incensing the *people* or the *choir*, we mean to compliment them with *divine honors.*”—Hawarden, *Church of Christ.*

“ The rites and ceremonies of the divine law delivered by Moses, do not oblige christians. Only the *moral precepts* concern them; as the seventh of the thirty-nine articles rightly observes: and hence it follows that, whatever was the sense of the first (or, as protestants will have it, the second) commandment, in respect of the Jews, christians are neither forbidden by it to have *images* of God, nor to give them an inferior *respect*; unless it can be shewn, that this is a thing of itself repugnant to reason. Pictures indeed, have no other virtue but that—of putting us in mind of what they represent. This they do effectually; and we find a convenience in having—a crucifix, for instance, before us when we pray, that the sight of it may help to fix our wandering thoughts upon Him, whom it represents as bleeding and dying for our salvation. And, if a child that loves his father, or a subject that is loyal to his prince, hath naturally some *respect* for his picture, why should the love which we bear to Christ and his saints be deemed unreasonable, if we shew an inferior honor and respect for *their* pictures; or express our esteem for the persons whom they represent, by such actions as are of themselves *indifferent*: such as the Jews might lawfully make use of—to the *ark*, to the *temple*, to the *holy vessels*; or protestants—to the *name* of Jesus, to the *altar*, to the *chair of state*?” Ibid.

Let us now see in what light the opponents of this doctrine, as well ancient as those of modern date, view a practice in itself so innocent and rational. Leo the Isaurian, who of a common soldier of mean extraction, had been exalted to the imperial dignity, and like Bonaparte, was a better soldier than divine, was the first to wage an open war against the use of holy images; and in 725, he, by an imperial edict, commanded them to be abolished; accusing the emperors his predecessors, all catholic bishops, and all christians in general—of idolatry; for his ignorance could not distinguish between a *relative* and an *absolute* worship. Ignorant, however, and stupid as he was, he deemed himself well qualified to dictate to the church of Christ—what it was henceforward to believe; and his impious son Copronimus and grandson Leo Chazarus, were not less zealous in forwarding by dint of persecution the hallowed work of image-breaking. The empress Irene, wife to the latter emperor, was always privately a catholic, though otherwise an artful and ambitious woman. After her husband’s miserable death in 780, she got the regency and whole government into her hands during the minority of her son Constantine, and put a stop to the persecution of the catholics. A general council was with her approbation convened at Nice in 787. The legates of pope Adrian are named first in the Acts, then St Tarasius patriarch of Constantinople, and after him the deputies of the Oriental patriarchs. The council consisted of three hundred and fifty

bishops, besides many abbots and other dignified priests and confessors. Having declared the sense of the church in relation to the matter in debate, the council declared that a *relative* honor was to be given to holy pictures and images. In the third session were read the letters of the patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem—all teaching the same doctrine of paying a *relative* honor to sacred images, no less than the letters of pope Adrian. In the fourth session were produced many passages from the fathers of the church in proof of the same opinion. After which, with one accord, they all concurred in following the tradition of the catholic church; declaring in their confession of faith, that they honored the mother of God, who is above all the heavenly powers; then, the angels, apostles, prophets, martyrs, doctors, and all the saints; as also, their pictures: for though the angels are incorporeal, they have appeared like men. In the fifth session were read many passages of fathers, falsified and corrupted by the Iconoclasts, as was clearly proved. In the sixth session the sham council of the Iconoclasts under Copronimus was condemned, and refuted as to every article; particularly, its false pretensions to the title of a *general* synod; for it was not received, but anathematized by the other bishops of the church; nor had the Roman pontiff any wise concurred to it, either personally or by his legates. The council urges against it—the desperate plea by which, like our modern reformers, it accused the church of idolatry. This is giving the lie to Christ whose kingdom, according to scripture, is everlasting. In fact, to accuse the whole church is insulting Christ himself.—They added, that the sham synod had contradicted itself; admitting as it did, that the six general councils had preserved the faith inviolate, and yet condemning the use of images, which it must allow to be more ancient than the sixth general council, and is indeed, of as high antiquity as the apostolic age. Finally, that whereas the Iconoclast council insinuated that, the clergy having fallen into idolatry, God had raised faithful *emperors* to destroy the fortresses of the devil, the Nicene synod vehemently condemns this; for the *bishops* are the depositaries of *tradition*, and not the emperors. After the close of the council, synodal letters were sent to all the prelates of the church, and in particular to the pope by whom it was approved.

Already had the doctrine of Iconoclasm been solidly refuted by many orthodox and learned theologians, some of whom had sealed their orthodoxy with their blood. But among the defenders of sacred images, few more eminently distinguished themselves than the great St John Damascen, who prefaces his treatise with the following sublime and truly christian exordium. “Seeing the church,” exclaims the holy doctor, “assailed by a furious storm, I think it my duty no longer to be silent; for I fear God more than an emperor of the earth.” Against the

errors of his adversaries he lays down the maxim—that the church cannot teach false doctrine;—consequently, it can never fall into idolatry. He distinguishes between the adoration due to God alone, which with St Augustine and other fathers he calls *Latria*; and that *inferior* veneration which is exhibited to the friends and servants of God,—entirely different, and infinitely beneath the former, and no more inconsistent with it, than the civil honor which the law of nature and holy scriptures command us to pay to princes and superiors. He goes on to prove, that the veneration rendered to the things which appertain to the Divine worship, as altars, churches and the like, is not less distinct from the supreme honor which we give to God. The precept of the old law forbidding images (unless restrained to idols) he says, was merely ceremonial, and regarded the Jews only; which law, if we restore, we must admit equally—circumcision and the Jewish Sabbath. The Iconoclasts, he informs us, very inconsistently allowed a religious honor to be due—to the holy place on Mount Calvary,—to the stone of the sepulchre,—to the book of the gospels,—to crosses and sacred vessels. Lastly, he proves the veneration of holy images lawful—by the authority of the fathers, and teaches at large, that the emperor is entrusted with the government of the state, “but has no authority to form decisions in points of ecclesiastical doctrine.” Dr Cave, although a protestant, avers, that no person of sound judgment can peruse the writings of St John—without admiring his extraordinary erudition, and the strength of his reasoning, especially in theological matters.

But do not catholics *adore* the *cross*? By no means; for *adoration* in English signifies strictly—*Divine honor*. However, in a wider sense, the word may sometimes signify a bare respect, then protestants themselves may be truly said to *adore* the *altar* when they bow to it, and catholics, in the same unrestricted signification of the term—to *adore* the *cross*. What the catholic church has defined concerning images, may be reduced to these three heads.

1st. That the images of Christ, and those of the blessed Virgin and of all the saints, may be lawfully made and kept by christians. Of this between protestants and catholics there is no dispute.

2nd. That in proper circumstances, considering what they represent, there is a reverence or respect due to them. This too, in general, if bishop Montague may be believed, is granted on both sides. (In Epitomio. p. 318.) The English translators of Monsieur du Pin, (cent. 8, p. 146,) grant *there is an inferior sort of respect and honor due to all things consecrated to God's service or instrumental in his worship*; as—to the sacred vessels,—to the bible, &c. but not *worship*. For *all respect*, say they, *is not worship*. But—whether respect in these cases is to be called *honor*

or worship, is merely a grammatical question, and therefore quite impertinent in a serious dispute.

3rd. That they may be lawfully kept in churches. This also, provided there be no danger of abuse, is generally admitted on both sides: and a catholic divine says very well, that “if in any place ignorant people be really in danger of idolatry or superstition, all pictures, as long as that danger continues, ought to be removed by their pastors.” (Delphinus, l. 3, de Ecclesia, apud Nat. Alex. T. 5, p. 774.) For the bare use and actual veneration of images is not a matter of faith, but of discipline only. Till idolatry and the recent remembrance of it was banished out of the christian world, that is, till about the middle of the fourth age, or somewhat later, there was little or no use of images in christian oratories, much less—of statues. Some few pastors, among whom St Epiphanius was one of the most distinguished, were even of opinion that they were absolutely repugnant to christianity. But others—of as much zeal and more discretion, and in greater numbers, opposed the mistake. That it was really an error—is the judgment, not of the catholic church only, but also of the Lutherans, and of all moderate protestants. (Montague, par. 2, Orig. § 144, p. 91. “Si quis novatorum, ait, in eâ versetur hæresi, illicitum esse, picturas, imagines, statuas conflare,—Ecclesiis ad ornatum proponere, et informationem rudiorum, homo vecors est.”) And since paganism has been utterly banished out of Christendom, the church did well to declare, that the images of Christ, and of his saints, are to be retained; and that due honor and veneration (or *respect*) is to be given to them. (Conc. Trid. Sess. 25. Pius IV. in professione fidei.)

Protestants indeed, accuse the second Nicene synod of—*ridiculous fables, gross misrepresentations of scripture, falsifications and impertinent allegations of the ancient fathers*. But, who ever commended the judge by whom he was condemned? In quoting the fathers they had not the protestant criterion; nor was it necessary for the settling of this manifest truth, that *christians are no where forbidden in the scripture, either to use, or to respect the images of Christ and his saints*. Good men are not always the best critics. We cannot doubt but the apostles, although they knew *nothing but Jesus Christ and him crucified*, were good pastors. But if we should say, they were very good critics, we should assert more than we know. The exceptions of the council of Frankfort against the decrees of the Nicene synod were built upon misconception, and a false translation of the Greek acts; and consequently, of no service to the protestant cause: and the objections of modern controversialists, brought forward and refuted a hundred thousand times, are ludicrous and impertinent. (See the controversy treated more at large by Dr Hawarden, in his first vol. of the *Church of Christ*,

from which principally the above abridgement is borrowed ; also Dictionaire Theol. de Bergier, Lives of Saints by the Rev. Alban Butler, Pluquet Dict. des Hæres. &c.)

JEROME OF PRAGUE—See HUSSITES.

JEWS—the descendants of Abraham, so called from Juda, one of the twelve sons of Jacob. Concerning their laws and customs the reader may consult the books of Moses, and may find a partial account of their religion and constitution in the epitome prefixed to this work.

The modern Jews have adopted many very singular practices and traditions unknown to their forefathers. When any person of their religion is buried, the nearest relation keeps the house for a week, sitting on the ground all the time, except on the Sabbath-day, when he attends at public prayer. During this week they do no business: the husband and the wife lodge apart; and at least ten people assemble morning and evening to pray. They offer up supplications for the soul of the person deceased all that week, at the close of which term they repair to the synagogue, light up lamps, and repeat their prayers, promising moreover, to distribute alms in behalf of the departed soul. This charitable service, which they justify by the tradition of their fore-elders, is reiterated at the end of every month, and of every year; and it is customary for the son to say each morning and evening—the prayer for the soul of his father or mother. They believe a paradise, where the blessed enjoy the beatific vision; and a hell for wicked men, in which some shall continue for ever; others, only for a time. No *Jew*, however, unless he be a heretic or nonconformist to the dictates of their rabbins, shall remain in hell above a year.

Their creed consists of thirteen articles, 1. That there is one God, the Creator of all things,—all-perfect and all-sufficient. 2. That he is an uncompounded, individual essence. 3. That, of course, he is immaterial. 4. Absolutely eternal. 5. Alone to be worshipped and adored by all his creatures. 6. They maintain—that there have been formerly, and may still arise—certain extraordinary personages called prophets. 7. That Moses is the greatest of the prophets. 8. That every syllable of the law was given to Moses by inspiration; and that the traditionary expositions of the precepts were entirely a divine revelation committed to him. 9. That the law is immutable;—in contradiction to the whole tenor of the gospels and christian revelation. 10. That God knows and governs all things. 11. That he rewards the observance, and punishes the violation, of his laws. 12. They vainly expect the appearance of the Messiah, whose coming, say they, is delayed. 13.

They believe that God will raise the dead to life, and judge all mankind.

Modern Jews are divided into two branches ;—The *Caraites*, who adopt as their sole rule in religion—the law of Moses ; and the *Rabbinists*, who receive also the traditions of the Talmud, which is a repertory of the most extravagant tales and idle dreams of their rabbins. The Talmud of Jerusalem, though more obscure, is of more ancient date than that of Babylon, which however, is generally preferred, as being more extensive. The present wandering state of this once *chosen* generation, is a striking exemplification of the Divine wrath, heretofore denounced against them for having impiously put to death the Saviour of the world.

ILLUMINATI—a sect which made its appearance in Spain towards the year 1575. The principal errors of this sect were—that through the medium of sublime prayer they attained to a state of such extraordinary perfection, that they no longer stood in any need of the sacraments, or of good works ; on the contrary, that they might without sin abandon themselves to actions the most infamous. Molinos and his disciples, a short time afterwards, adopted the same immoral principles. The sect, after having been suppressed in Spain, was renewed in France in 1634. But Lewis XIII. caused them to be prosecuted with such diligence and severity, that they were quickly annihilated. They pretended, that God had revealed to one of their number named Brother Antony Bocquet, a new system of belief, and method of life, hitherto unknown to the professors of christianity ; that by adopting this method persons might rapidly arrive at the perfection of the saints, and even of the blessed Virgin herself, who, they asserted, had possessed no more than an ordinary degree of virtue. They added, that by their new invented method they were rendered capable of so strict a union with God, that their actions in this state were all divine. Like some Methodists of our day, these enthusiasts maintained, that none of the doctors of the church had understood—what true devotion was ; that St Peter, in comparison with them, was but a dunce in the science of spirituality, as was also his fellow apostle St Paul ; and that the universal church was left in darkness and the grossest ignorance with regard to the genuine spirit and practice of the creed. They affirmed, that all was lawful that agreed with conscience, whether erroneous or otherwise ; and that within the space of ten years the whole world would embrace their sentiments, and then there would be no want of priests,—of religious orders in the church ; of curates, bishops or other ecclesiastical superiors. (Voyez Sponde, Vittorio Siri, &c.)

IMPECCABLES. See **ANABAPTISTS**, of whom they formed a branch.

INCORRUPTICOLÆ—were a branch of Eutychians, who maintained that in the incarnation of the Son of God, the human nature had been absorbed by the Divine, and consequently, that the two natures were confounded in one. They first appeared in 535. In asserting that the body of Jesus Christ was incorruptible, they intimated that, from its first formation in the Virgin's womb, it was incapable of any alteration or change, and never experienced either hunger or thirst; and that, before his death as well as after his resurrection, he eat without necessity or appetite. The consequence of this their error was—that the body of Jesus Christ was impassible and not liable to pain, and that thus our Divine Saviour had not really suffered for our salvation. This was in fact, the natural tendency of Eutychianism. See the article.

INDEPENDENTS—sectaries who disclaim subjection to ecclesiastical authority. In matters of faith and doctrine, they profess rigid Calvinism; and their independence is chiefly in regard of discipline, rather than in the tenets of religion. They insist, that each particular church or religious society, contains within itself every requisite for its own conduct and government; that it possesses full ecclesiastical jurisdiction and authority, independent of every other church or churches, their deputies, synodical decisions, or of any bishop whatever.

During the civil wars the independent party having gained the ascendancy, almost all the other sects inimical to the English establishment, flocked to their standard. They consisted, first, of Presbyterians who differ from the genuine Independents in points of discipline only: secondly, of a confused variety of Anabaptists, Socinians, Antinomians, Familists, Libertines and others, scarcely deserving of the name of christians, and whom Spanheim compliments with the epithet of *counterfeit* Independents.

Independentism has still its followers in England, in North America and in Holland. One Morel attempted to introduce it among the protestants in France; but the synod of La Rochelle in which the famous Beza presided, and that of Charenton held in the year 1644, condemned the system, though not with much consistency. For what right had they to interfere, whether the Independents proved well or ill their doctrines from holy scripture? They had texts at hand to favour their pretensions; and, in the main, they did not stretch the fundamental principle of protestantism beyond its full and natural extent. Mosheim who, doubtless, was aware of this, has racked his utmost ingenuity to exculpate the Independents of the enormities and seditious conduct imputed to them by our historians.

In the judgment, however, of the English translator of his ecclesiastical history, he has failed in the attempt. He thinks little of their public professions, because they were made in untoward circumstances; and, it is a fact, that the Calvinists in general have uniformly, when in their power, set up republicanism on the ruins of their former monarchical government, and never yielded submission to their lawful sovereigns, but by compulsion. In a word, every well informed and unbiassed mind will readily acknowledge, that neither the origin nor the demeanour of the sect will ever do much honor to the protestant cause, or that of christianity at large.

INDIFFERENT (the)—a sect of Anabaptists. See the article.

INFERNALIANS—maniacs of the sixteenth century, who impiously maintained, that during our Blessed Redeemer's reposing in the tomb, his soul descended into the pit of hell, and was tormented with the damned. (See Gauthier, Chron. sæc. 16.) Calvin himself was not ashamed to say—that, during its detention there, it was abandoned to all the horrors of despair; another most flagrant instance this—of the frightful abuse of holy scripture by *private interpretation*!

JOHNSONIANS—so called from the late Mr Johnson, a dissenting minister at Liverpool. They have places of worship at Norwich, Liverpool and in the neighbourhood of Halifax, and in some other parts. These sectaries deny the Trinity of persons in God, and disbelieve the pre-existence of Christ, although they very inconsistently maintain him to be properly God. They reject also, the doctrine of original sin, but still hold that no man will savingly believe the gospel, without the special influence of the Spirit. They deny the natural immortality of the soul, and say that the whole of man is at present mortal; yet allow the separate existence of the soul between death and the resurrection. They contend too, that it is impossible for a real christian to have any doubts and fears respecting his acceptance with God. This idea, totally at variance with St Paul, who advises us to work out our salvation *with fear and trembling*, they seem to have borrowed from John Calvin, or perhaps more immediately, from their contemporaries the modern Methodists. Resurrection they extend to the whole animal creation, not less than to the human race. (See Mr Evans's *Sketch*.)

JOVINIANISTS—were the followers of Jovinian, who towards the close of the fourth century, after having lived many years in the practice of great austerities under the conduct of St Ambrose, began to tire of monastic perfection, and preferred the delicacies of Rome, and the charms of liberty, to the confine-

ment and severities of the cloister. To justify this extraordinary step, he insinuated, that abstinence and sensuality were of themselves indifferent things, and that all meats were equally lawful when taken with thanksgiving; that the state of virginity was not more perfect than that of matrimony; and that the Holy Mother of God did not remain a virgin after her conception. He held likewise, that those who were once regenerated in baptism, could no more be vanquished by the devil; that, consequently, all the regenerate would receive an equal recompence in heaven. According to St Augustine, he moreover maintained with the Stoic philosophers, that all sins were equally enormous. These errors were condemned by Pope Siricius, and by a council which St Ambrose held at Milan in 390.

St Jerome, with his usual vivacity of style, vindicated the merit of virginity. To some he appeared to reprobate the married state. But the holy doctor undertook to shew, that his meaning had been misinterpreted; and explained the passages which had given offence. The charge against St Jerome has, however, been renewed by protestants, who have adopted a great part of the errors of Jovinian. They pretend that, after indulging in intemperate invective, he had been reduced to the necessity of contradicting himself: it would be well if the adversaries of catholicity were candid enough, in their turn, to retract or to explain, what is susceptible of misconception in their writings, or calculated to scandalize their readers. So far from censuring, we should applaud their candor and their generosity: although in fact, St Jerome was under no such awkward predicament. See his book against Jovinian, Fleury, *Hist. Eccles.* t. 4, l. 19, n. 19, &c.

ISLEBIANS. See AGRICOLAITES.

ISOCHRISTÆ—about the middle of the sixth century began to maintain in some parts of the Eastern empire, that the apostles were to be exalted in heaven to an equal dignity with our Saviour Christ. They were condemned by the council of Constantinople in 553. See ORIGINISTS.

JUDAIZING Christians—were those among the converted Jews who held that, in order to salvation, it was not enough to believe in Jesus Christ, and to practise what he taught; but that it was moreover necessary for the faithful, diligently to keep the ceremonial observances ordained by the Mosaic law; for instance, the Sabbath, Circumcision, Abstinence from certain meats; and that even the Gentile converts were bound to observe them. The contrary was defined by the apostles in the council of Jerusalem, in the year 51, (Act. c. 15.) Those who, notwithstanding this their decision obstinately adhered to their former opinion,

were esteemed unorthodox; and St Paul severely condemns them in his epistle to the Galatians, written about four years after the council. However, it must be remarked, that the apostles had not forbidden these legal ordinances to converts that were born Jews. And the christian church still observes certain religious practices in use with the Jews. Hence unbelievers object—that we still continue to Judaize; and the objection originates with protestants. St Leo answered their exceptions fourteen hundred years ago. (Serm. 16, n. 6.) “While under the New Testament,” says this most learned and judicious father of the church, “we observe certain practices of the old dispensation, the law of Moses seems to add new weight to the precepts of the gospel; and we are more and more convinced, that Jesus Christ did not come to abolish, but to fulfil the law: and although we no longer stand in need of types which announced the future coming of the Saviour, nor of figures, while we are in possession of the substance, we still deem it convenient to retain what may contribute to promote the worship of God, and sanctity of morals; since these are things—both equally enjoined by the old and new dispensations.” These too, we have received from apostolical tradition.

JUMPERS—a branch of the Methodist society, originating in Wales. It began about the year 1760. “In the course of a few years, says Mr Evans in his *Sketch*, the advocates of groaning and loud talking, as well as of loud singing—repeating the same line or stanza over and over thirty or forty times,—became more numerous, and were found among some of the other denominations in the principality, and continue to this day. Several of the more zealous itinerant preachers in Wales, recommended to the people to cry out *Gogoniant* (the Welch word for *glory*,)—*Amen*, &c. &c.—to put themselves in violent agitations; and finally—to jump until they were quite exhausted. This advice they complied with accordingly, so as often to be obliged to fall down on the floor, or on the field, where this kind of worship was performed;” which singular species of fanaticism is supposed to be rather on the decline, though other ceremonies of a nature not less ridiculous and eccentric, are still prevalent in some assemblies of the Methodistic persuasion. See Mr Evans, article **JUMPERS**.

KILHANITES—See **METHODISTS**.

L

LATITUDINARIANS—those who very liberally accord salvation to all religious sectaries without exception, however widely they may differ in their systems of belief and practice; and thus evince their sincere wishes to enlarge the *narrow* way that leads to bliss. Their philanthropy would entitle them to the gratitude of a large proportion of mankind, were their doctrine but well supported. It has, at least among protestants, the advantage of consistency. The great Bossuet has fully proved in his sixth *Avertissement aux Protestants*, that Latitudinarianism or indifference in religious articles, evidently results from the principle which gave birth to the reformation; namely, that the church is not infallible in her decisions; that none are obliged to yield submission without discussing first their plausibility; and that the only rule of faith is Sacred Scripture. On this principle too, Socinians rest their claim of toleration from their protestant brethren; scripture being the alleged rule of faith equally with both parties. In vain would protestants assert the distinction of *fundamentals* and *non-fundamentals*: by their own avowal, this distinction has no existence in Holy Scripture.

The catholic church, less temerarious and more consistent, contends that, to decide who shall, and who shall not be saved, belongs not to man, but to the Deity. When once God exacts from us, as the necessary medium of salvation, that we faithfully believe in his word, we are not privileged to exempt any person from the obligation of believing: and, in effect, it is an absurdity to imagine that God has revealed to us his truths, and left it, notwithstanding, to our caprice to view them in what light we please; as well might we have been left without any revelation at all. But, in fact, God has confided the depositum of revelation to his church; and if in charging her to teach all nations, he had not imposed on all—the obligation of submitting to her doctrine, this would have been a perfect solecism of legislation.

During the long lapse of eighteen hundred years, this church has maintained, invariably, both her principles and her practice. She has always retrenched from her communion every sectarian, that has obstinately vindicated his own independence. The absurdities, the glaring contradictions, the impieties into which they have all been hurried in their turn when severed from the catholic church, alone suffice to demonstrate the necessity of submission. Do then the *Latitudinarians* facilitate the way to heaven, or rather, widen the broad road of perdition? This they may term intolerance of *belief*: but, the spirit of the catholic church is not the spirit of persecution: its arms are merely spiritual; and it deprecates from itself and others all violence and blood-

shed. Only, with St Paul, it announces to the world, that *without faith*, which he says is *one, it is impossible to please God*. If in this there be a breach of charity, then must that divine apostle equally share the guilt.

Our readers may be apt to infer, that all will be lost, by the above principles, who are not in the external communion of the catholic church. We say not so; but those only, who by their own fault unhappily remain excluded. Well meaning christians of whatever denomination, so disposed as to be sincerely desirous of finding out, and of embracing the truth when once discovered, are implicitly true believers, and catholics in their heart. All these the church of God acknowledges her children, although the unhappy circumstances of their birth and education prevent them from recognising their rightful mother. Will the eighteenth of the thirty-nine articles of the church of England bear a more *charitable* interpretation? *They also*, says this article, *are to be had accursed, that presume to say, That every man shall be saved by the law or sect which he professeth, so that he be diligent to frame his life according to that law and the light of nature. For holy scripture doth set out unto us only the name of Jesus Christ, whereby men must be saved.* And will protestants still forget their own creed, however at defiance with the grand reforming maxim—in order to calumniate more wantonly their fellow christians!

LOLLARDS—sectarians of the fourteenth century, thus named from one Walter Lolhard a German, who commenced his apostleship in 1315. The greater part of his erroneous opinions he borrowed from the Albigenses: he taught—that the devils had been banished heaven unjustly; that they would one day be readmitted there, and that on the contrary, Michael and the other angels, authors of this pretended injustice, would be eternally damned, as well as all those who should refuse to embrace his doctrine. It spread very rapidly in Austria, Bohemia and other places. This sect rejected the ceremonies of the church; the invocation of saints; the Blessed Eucharist, and the sacrifice of the mass, as well as extreme-unction, and satisfactory works of penance. They maintained that baptism was of no avail, confession useless, and matrimony a professed whoredom. Lolhard was condemned to the flames at Cologne in 1322, and at his execution betrayed no symptoms either of fear, or of repentance.

In England the Wicklefites were denominated Lollards, because these two sects, by reason of the similarity of most of their opinions, had formed a junction; and they were both condemned by Thomas Arundel, archbishop of Canterbury, in the council of London 1396, and in that of Oxford in 1408. It has been very justly observed, that the Wicklefites had predis-

posed the minds of the people for the schism of Henry VIII. in England, and that the Lollards had prepared the way for John Huss in Bohemia.

Mosheim gives a different account of the origin of these fanatics, who, he says, under the garb of religion concealed their immoralities; and on this account were the heretics of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries called indiscriminately—*Lollards*.

LUTHER—the great apostle of protestantism, was born at Isleb, a town of Saxony, towards the close of the fifteenth century, 1483. He studied his course of theology at Wittenburg, proceeded doctor and commenced professor in that university, after having first embraced the religious institute of the Augustinians. Europe at that time lived in peaceable subjection to the see of Rome—while Leo X. a person of extraordinary qualifications, and a munificent patron of merit, occupied the pontifical chair. He formed the project of erecting a magnificent church in honor of St Peter, and granted indulgences to all that should contribute towards the expences of the edifice. Luther's zeal was awakened—at the abuses which are said to have been practised in the collection of these charities. He entered warmly into the merits of the cause, and soon contested the efficacy of the indulgences themselves. The dispute was maintained with much heat by the papal commissioners and the theologians of Francfort; while Luther on his side, indulged in intemperate abuse, and quite forgot the modest reserve of religious subordination. He was cited to appear before his Holiness at Rome; and Leo X. issued forth a bull, in which he declared the validity of the indulgences, and pronounced that, in quality of successor to St Peter, and vicar of Jesus Christ, he had an undoubted right to grant them; that this was the doctrine of the catholic church, and an essential article of her communion. He published another bull, proscribing Luther's opinions, and commanding him to burn his books and to retract his errors; which if he neglected to do within a given time, he was to be esteemed a heretic.

Luther resolved to appeal from the papal bull to a general council, and as the elector of Saxony had begun to patronise his sentiments, he had the boldness publicly to burn the bull at Wittenburg. This action was perfectly congenial with Luther's violent temper; but it proved, eventually, in his regard, an act also, of policy. The people on the sudden lost that reverential awe which hitherto had impressed them, for every decree proceeding from the Roman pontiff; and the confidence which they had always reposed in the efficacy of indulgences. Luther himself, protected by his great admirer and patron the elector of Saxony, disregarded both the ordinances of the emperor Charles V. and the censures of Rome fulminated against him in

1520. Previous to his excommunication he had appealed to the pope, and promised submission to his judgment: but when he found himself condemned, and his opinions proscribed, he no longer observed any bounds. Nor did the condemnation of many celebrated universities make the least impression on his haughty mind.

When first this innovator declaimed against the abuse of indulgences, it is probable he was not himself aware how far the impetuosity of his character would impel him; else, we presume, his mind would have recoiled with horror from the view of that chaos of errors and false doctrines, into which he was about to plunge. He began with censuring the abuse of indulgences, next maintained their inefficacy, then denied to the church the power of absolving sinners, the necessity or utility of contrition for sin, and of whatever we term *satisfactory* works of penance;—fasting, repentance, celibacy, corporal austerities, alms-giving, and the like. Luther did not hesitate to pronounce them all absolutely useless, and thus to condemn of folly, at least, the saints of every preceding age, together with St Paul and all his fellow-apostles. Monastic vows he also reprobated,—and the continency of priests; and proved he was in earnest by taking to wife a nun.

So unaccountable was the perversity of his maxims, that he taught on one side, that all human actions were sins, and still with inconceivable infatuation insisted, that a man justified by faith, could never sin at all; because, according to him, God will not impute sin to one thus justified. Mons. Bossuet has placed this absurdity in its most glaring light. (Hist. Variat. l. 1, n. 9, &c.) Luther moreover rejects free-will, which he terms a slave; and says, that God operates alike in man both sin and virtue! He pretends that the sacraments possess no other efficacy than that of exciting us to faith, and maintains only two sacraments—baptism and the eucharist, as exclusively producing this effect: the confession of Augsburg indeed, added penance; although the Lutherans seem in practice not to have insisted much upon this article of their confession. The Anabaptists and Socinians infer from Luther's sacramental system, that infants are incapable of baptism, because incapable of actual faith. Transubstantiation Luther also discarded, though he defended with invincible obstinacy against the Sacramentarians—the real presence of the body and blood of our Saviour Christ in the eucharist. Carlstad, his colleague in the university of Wittenberg, maintained that if the real presence was to be defended,—transubstantiation must equally be admitted. He and his adherents in the doctrine of a *figurative* presence only, were nick-named Sacramentarians, and excommunicated by Luther; although it was embraced by Zuinglius and Calvin, the other two great Fathers of the reformation: nor could he ever be in-

duced to mitigate the sentence. After his decease, when desired to explain—how the body of Jesus Christ could be in the consecrated host *together with the bread*, some Lutherans replied—by *impanation*; others—by *ubiquity*; others again—by *concomitance* or a *sacramental union*. Whence it appears, they did not rightly comprehend the meaning of their master in respect of this important article.

Luther moreover denied the *sacrifice* of the mass, purgatory, and the utility of praying for the dead: he rejected the invocation and intercession of the saints; and maintained that ordination conferred upon the ministers of God neither any character nor supernatural power; consequently, according to Luther's principles, there is no hierarchy,—no true priesthood: this consequence too, he did not disavow. With regard to the indissolubility of matrimony his scruples were but trifling; and he granted to the Landgrave of Hesse the extraordinary privilege of having two wives: nor were his sentiments extremely delicate with reference to the very pardonable crime of adultery—of which himself was more than once, perhaps wrongfully, suspected; although his singular method of explaining the ten commandments, particularly the sixth (or as some arrange them, the seventh in the catalogue) may well account for such a rude suspicion. Enraged that the pope should have presumed to condemn his doctrine and excommunicate his person, Luther in revenge proclaimed him antichrist, denied that the church had any right to inflict censures or to proscribe errors, and defined Holy Scripture alone to be the rule of faith to christians. But, by the most revolting inconsistency, he himself condemned the Sacramentarians and the Anabaptists; exercised among his followers all the authority of a sovereign pontiff; excommunicated, and would willingly have exterminated, had it been in his power, all that differed with him in opinion. In his new version of the scripture, which he compelled his sectarists exclusively to adopt, he thought fit to retrench the epistle of St James, because it taught too clearly—the necessity of good works. In this however, his disciples and our English protestants have not imitated their daring patriarch; they have restored it to its rank in the sacred canon, as well as the Apocalypse of St John which is not admitted by the Calvinists.

The principle by which Luther repudiated all the ordinances and institutions of the church, as inventions merely human, led him to maintain, that in virtue of that liberty of the children of God which christians had acquired in baptism, none were subject to any human law. No sooner had he published his treatise upon Christian Liberty, than a part of the German peasantry took up arms against their lawful princes, and committed the most atrocious acts of insubordination and rebellion. But such disorders, it would seem, did not alarm the piety of Luther:

they were what he expected, and endeavoured to promote; for it was a maxim with him, that the gospel must be promulgated through torrents of blood. Consistently with this evangelical principle, he passed his life in the midst of tumult,—actuated with the most furious passions of hatred and vengeance against—all that ventured to oppose him. It was the character given him by his most intimate friends and confidants; and to be convinced of its correctness, we have only to consult his own writings.

Such was the boasted hero of the reformation; and such, originally, were the prominent features of Protestantism; which with astonishing rapidity was soon diffused over a great part of Germany, Prussia, Pomerania, and partially, of Poland: so early as the year 1525 two of Luther's disciples travelled into Sweden. Gustavus Vasa had newly mounted the Swedish throne, and through motives of self interest and ambition, himself became a Lutheran. This prince soon made Lutheranism the established religion of that kingdom—in order to reduce the power of the clergy, and to vest at once all ecclesiastic property as well as influence, in his own person. Christiern III. king of Denmark, entered into similar views; and, aided by the counsels and by the arms of Gustavus, he also, became absolute in 1536, and caused the confession of Augsbourg to be received as the rule of faith in Denmark. Under the reign of Sigismund I. Lutheranism had only a few private sectarists in Poland. But after his decease in 1548, under his son and successor Sigismund Augustus—a feeble and notoriously voluptuous prince, that kingdom presently swarmed, with—Lutherans, Hussites, Sacramentarians, Calvinists, Anabaptists, Unitarians or Socinians, Greek schismatics, and a numberless variety of other sects.

Lutheranism had also penetrated into Hungary and Transylvania, during the tumults which had agitated those two kingdoms; but since their annexation to the Austrian domains, it has gradually declined. In France, the emissaries of Luther made at first some proselytes,—till the legislature interfered; those of Calvin were more successful, and ushered in the most dreadful state convulsions together with their novel doctrines. Nearly similar was the fate of England. Neither Luther however, nor his disciples, had any share in the meritorious schism of Henry VIII. barring perhaps, the influence of their bad example upon the mind of that tyrannical prince. While a catholic, he had published a book against Luther, and persisted till his dying day in his hatred of Lutheranism. The new form of religion which he obtruded upon the nation, disgusted equally both protestants and catholics. But under the infant king Edward VI. Peter Martyr and Bernardin Okinus introduced the Calvinistic principles.

To the more attentive of our readers the rapid progress of

Lutheranism will not appear astonishing. In 1521 Charles V. in the diet of Worms, had indeed proscribed its author, and issued a decree unfavorable to his adherents: but Frederic's protection and partiality for Luther's system rendered it of no avail. The members of the diet of Nuremburg in 1523 were more eager to redress their own real or pretended grievances, than those of the church; and the two succeeding diets held at Spire, the one in 1525, the other in 1529, were not less friendly to the new religion, because it promoted their several avaricious or ambitious views. The princes of the empire that had embraced the sentiments of Luther, here protested against the imperial decrees; and from this circumstance is derived the name of *Protestant*.

In 1530, at the diet of Augsburg, the princes above mentioned signed a confession of their faith, which from this diet was denominated the Confession of Augsburg. Here they pledged their future submission to the decrees of a general council—to be assembled by the pope. This solemn engagement they did not eventually think proper to make good. They afterwards at Smalcald made a league against the emperor, and all that should adhere to his interests. Luther himself approved it, and counselled moreover a general war against the pope and whoever might presume, like him, to oppose the promulgation of his new gospel.

Paul III. in concert with the emperor and the king of France, in 1542 convoked a general council at Trent—to terminate the religious contests which compromised the tranquillity of the empire and that of Europe. The synod was not closed before the year 1563; nor would the protestants be ruled by its decisions, notwithstanding their repeated promises to that effect. Luther indeed, was now no more. The pacification concluded at Passaw between Charles V. and the princes of the empire, and subsequently that of Augsburg, had secured to the protestants religious toleration and liberty of conscience; but their mutual dissensions, and their quarrels with the Zuinglians and Calvinists—as well as with the catholics, continued; till the treaty of Munster, called also the treaty of Osnabourg and of Westphalia, in 1648 placed things nearly on the same footing as at the commencement of the French revolution. It was guaranteed by all the potentates of Europe.

This peace however, was by no means adequate to produce either harmony of sentiment or union of heart. Confusion is the natural result of the very principles of the reformation. Of this assertion we shall soon behold a striking proof in the short narrative of one of the most zealous champions of Protestantism,—the *Ecclesiastical and Political History* of Hornius:—

“Luther having established,” says this learned protestant, “the right which each individual possesses—of interpreting the

sacred scriptures, asserted too, that aided by the light of heaven, he possessed also the privilege of affixing to them their true interpretation. Admitting with Luther, at least the former of these principles, Zuinglius presents himself; and boldly declares that—not Luther, but himself long before Luther—had explored their genuine interpretation. Carlostad, with equal intrepidity proclaims, that he has made a more accurate discovery of their real signification than either of the above apostles; and without demur, in defiance of his master's authority, he breaks in pieces the images which the latter had suffered to remain in the churches at Wittenburg, and stirs up great commotions in that city. Not long after, these three leaders of the reformation commenced their dispute respecting the holy eucharist;—a dispute in which were often blended circumstances the most ludicrous, with acts of violence the most atrocious. The champions on each side, drew after them individually an immense multitude of followers in different kingdoms, provinces and districts; just as the pretended evidence of the sense of the scriptures, or their pretended inspiration, actuated them;—or rather, just as their ignorance, and their passions, in unison with those of their fanatic leaders, misguided them.”

“During the contestation between Luther, Zuinglius and Carlostadius, a Silesian gentleman of the name of Schwenckfeld, discovered another interpretation of the text *this is my body*, extremely different both from that of Luther, and from that of his two antagonists. He maintained, that the word *this* expresses—not elemental, but purely spiritual bread and wine; and proceeding from error to error, contended soon, that the letter of the scripture is useless, and that all exterior ministry in the church is superfluous. Schwenckfeld drew after him a considerable number of partisans, whose descendants still subsist unmolested, in certain villages of Silesia.”

“Beginning with the same maxims as the first reformers, and raising upon them the fabric of their singular institution, Stork and Munster,—both of them the disciples, and the latter the great favourite of Luther,—about the same period commenced teaching a variety of tenets, in opposition to the dictates of their master. The most prominent of these tenets were—the necessity of rebaptising all that had been baptised in their infancy—and the establishment of a new kingdom foretold in the apocalypse; which was to last a thousand years, and to originate with *their* mission. Fired with the ambition, and convinced of the necessity of forming and completing this new empire, they taught—that it was pious, expedient, and even necessary, to depose and murder all princes and magistrates, who should venture to oppose its establishment. Munster assured his followers, that God had given him in a vision the sword of Gideon, and even commissioned the archangel Michael to assist him. Suffice

it to say, that soon above 100,000 deluded creatures believed and followed the impostor; upwards of 50,000 of whom perished in the field, the wretched victims of his ambition, and the dupes of their own credulity. The greater part of them fell—without either fighting, or attempting to run away; for Munster had assured them, that he would stop the balls in the foldings of his robe, or catch them; so that no one should be wounded.”

“After the death of Munster who met with the fate which his crimes had amply merited, his sect—far from decreasing, continued to multiply, and counted an immense herd of adherents in every country where the seeds of the reformation had been sown. He had several successors, some of them as ambitious, and many of them as frantic as himself;—Rotman, Knipperdoling, Matthews, and John of Leyden—who from the honorable profession of a taylor aspired to the supreme dignity, and was in fact proclaimed by his fanatic party—the *Universal Monarch of the Earth*; and this religious ruffian—breathing nothing but inspiration, spread wide around him slaughter and devastation. Fortunately, however, for mankind, the dreadful power which these men possessed, and the more dreadful effects which it produced, were but transient. The states in which the sect was most numerous, alarmed for their own security, adopted measures to repress it; and these measures, in proportion to their rigor, were in general, effectual. The consequence was—that, as they could no longer be seditious with impunity, they gradually became more moderate; and, chiefly by the influence of Menno, abandoned the idea of recurring any more to arms. Having, therefore, sunk to a state of indolence or inaction; and instead of contending with princes for their kingdoms, disputing with themselves about words, they soon began to fritter into distinct societies, which have very little resemblance with each other, except in the general appellation of Anabaptists. They are divided into Mennonites, Hutterians, Gabrielites, Moravians, &c. &c. among whom there prevails a degree of confusion, equal to that which reigned at Babel. Some deny the Trinity; some the distinction of persons; some maintain that all learning, particularly that of the languages, is derived from Satan; with other like absurdities. Such in a word is the multiplicity of their discordant opinions, that it is difficult if not impossible, to unravel their religious system.”

“From the school of the Anabaptists came forth several new heresiarchs—George Delph, who called himself the true Messiah, and was followed by great numbers of disciples in several parts of Holland—Henry surnamed *House of Charity*, who ranked himself above Moses and Jesus Christ—William Postel, who taught—that himself had delivered *men* from eternal death, while his wife had done the same good turn in favor of the *woman kind*.”

“ About this period began to appear on the theatre of the reformation—the sect of the Socinians. Their doctrines are a compound of those of Ebion, Arius, Sabellius, Photinus, Abelard; and of several other heresiarchs. With a boldness, says our protestant historian, *which christianity should not tolerate, and which is dangerous to civil governments*, they began to corrupt and undermine all the truths of revelation. Servetus was the first founder of the sect: Gentilis gave it some celebrity; but Lælius Socinus the bosom friend of Calvin, diffused it; while Faustus the nephew of Lælius, organised it into system.”

“ To the aid of impiety in 1552 rose up also—the heresy of the Ubiquitarians, who in addition to many other errors maintained, that the body of Jesus Christ is every where personally present; and that all the properties of the Divine nature were infused into his human nature by the hypostatic union. Hence they taught, that the body of Christ is contained—in a glass of beer, in a sack of corn, in the rope with which the criminal is hanged. Their first apostle was John Westphalus, a minister of Hambourg, succeeded by Breñtius, Wigard, Illyricus, Oseander, Schmidling and several others, the greatness of whose learning was exceeded, only by the greatness of their impiety.”

“ In Holland the reformation had hardly superseded catholicity when its tranquillity began to be disturbed by the new and formidable society of the Arminians. These, treading in the footsteps of the Socinians, or more properly real Socinians themselves—not only entertain the most impious tenets respecting grace and predestination; (though not half so impious in fact, as those of either Luther or Calvin) they also teach that it is wrong to worship the Holy Ghost, and that the Trinity is merely an object of speculation, &c. Armed with these errors,—the Arminians formed a schism in the churches of the Low Countries, the suppression of which excited fresh seditions and disturbances throughout the nation. At length, however, the arm of persecution, aided by the synod of Dort, did re-establish peace, though nothing like unanimity.”

“ Among the reformed churches, frequent attempts were made to bring about a reconciliation: but such was the turbulence of their respective leaders, and such their ardor for error and innovation, that every attempt proved fruitless and abortive. Hulseman, Calovius, Danhauwer, with a crowd of other reformers and particularly those of Wittenburg, armed themselves with new violence to create divisions.”

“ In England,” continues Hornius, “ as in all other countries, the introduction of the reformation was the introduction of discord, disorder and division. The passions of Henry had altered many of the ancient doctrines of the church. Edward added fresh changes to those of Henry; and Elizabeth improved upon the innovations of the infant king. However, along with

all these changes, there was still permitted to subsist a multitude of popish ceremonies, and the tyrant anti-christian institution of *episcopacy*. All these in general, but particularly the latter, were extremely obnoxious to the followers of Calvin, who at this period were become very numerous, and very formidable to the nation—under the name of Puritans. The contest between these and the established sect forms a very striking epoch in the annals of English history.”

“ The Puritans early began to marshal themselves into various classes—of Brownists, Separatists, Semi-separatists, Robinsonians, and the numerous sects of Independents: the number exceeds forty. In short, England was infected with the venom of every species of corrupted opinion. There was nothing sacred that was not reprobated as profane; nor hardly any thing profane which was not held up as sacred. Even the most ignorant, and the very dregs of the populace became preachers. They preached—(the case is precisely the same with the Methodists at present); and the mob was all credulity and attention. How well,—to use the words of the commentators of the English bible on the 25th verse of the 10th chapter of Genesis—how well does the name of Phaleg become our times? How well might we give this name—(it signifies *division*)—to every child that comes into the world! How easy would it be to fill up our annals with this name; so deplorable are our divisions. Never since the creation of the world did there exist so many monstrous opinions, as there are at present in England.”

“ From the body of the Independents, as from the Trojan horse, there issued, as already has been noticed, more than forty different sects. Some of them rejected the scriptures; some taught that there was no longer any church of God whatever upon earth,—these were called Waiters:—some maintained, that there was indeed a church, but that it was hidden; and these were called *Seekers*. The opinions of some of these sectaries are too horrible to be related. For my own part, I think as those do, who say that England is the great nursery of error, and the grand theatre where reigns the most dreadful licentiousness of believing, writing, and of teaching too, whatever passion or folly is pleased to dictate. The history of the heresies and schisms of other nations presents nothing to be compared with the scenes of horror, which it exhibits.” Here, I think, Hornius shews some partiality, and would willingly have his readers overlook the equally impious and unaccountably absurd opinions of his fellow-countrymen, from whom this nation borrowed its unorthodoxy.

He goes on: “ At periods also, still more recent than those to which I have alluded, Great Britain continued to hold out to the rest of Europe (now indeed somewhat recovered from its late insanity) nearly the same exemplifications of extravagance

and impiety with the above. You might often find in one family as many religions as there were individuals that composed it. The pretext and the apology for all this was—liberty of conscience, and the privilege of universal toleration. Nothing in reality is more flattering to vanity and self-love, than to be the arbiter of one's own belief.”—HORNIIUS.

Such is the description given by this enlightened protestant—of the errors and confusion resulting from the reformation; and such the concluding reflections which he makes upon the principle from which they emanated. It is contained in the following words of Luther—*Judge for yourselves: this is the sole rule of truth, and the sole rule of gospel liberty.* What a prolific source of errors and impieties is here laid open to the human mind; and how easy is it by it to account for all the heresies and abuses, the disorders and the horrors of the reformation! “Surely,” exclaims the author of the Sermons for the Sundays after Pentecost, from whom I have copied the above; “surely—if truth be *divine* and essentially *one*; and if the profession of truth, as undoubtedly it is, be essential to salvation; then should the path which conducts to it be more secure, and the means of attaining it, more easy. To permit *all* in matters of religion—yea, to *command* all to follow their individual private judgement,—this appears to me worse than nonsense. It would, I think, be just equally wise to command the ignorant and unexperienced landsman—without sail or rudder, without helm or compass—to sail amid storms and darkness, to the pole;—just equally wise to bid the populace be temperate and sober, and yet open pipes of wine, or oceans of liquor, to their intemperance!”

“Since the period when Horniius drew up his genealogy of the errors of the reformation, it is well known how much the frightful generation has increased. Error since that epoch has been daily begetting error, and fancy and fanaticism producing folly and superstition. Each parent sect has, with portentous fecundity, generated an offspring too numerous, in some instances, for industry to account—an offspring soon, like its parent heresy, producing another offspring, innumerable as itself, and equally positive of its own exclusive claim to orthodoxy. But why look for unity and order where individuals have all an equal share of liberty—where each one has the right to judge and decide, and none the power to control his decision? Admit only—a similar system of civil liberty into politics, how soon would society exhibit a scene of anarchy and discord? But, the fact is, protestant governments understand much better the nature of civil liberty, and regulate much more wisely, its influences, than their churches fix the boundaries of their religious liberty.” (Ibid. Sermon.)

But enough of Lutheranism and the effects of Lutheran fanaticism. We have refuted its erroneous tenets respecting the hierarchy of the church, under the article AERIUS; respecting

vows and the celibacy of the priesthood, under that of VIGILANTIUS; its errors regarding the nature of the catholic church, under the article DONATISTS; those on transubstantiation, under the article BERENGARIUS; on laical communion in both kinds, under that of the HUSSITES, and the pope's supremacy, under the article GREEKS. We will examine in few words the catholic doctrine concerning indulgences, the sacraments, the sacrifice of the mass, the christian's rule of faith, and lastly, the infallibility of the church of Christ. Meanwhile we will just premise, that if the whole body of the church of Christ did err in faith, as Luther asserts it did, but as we shall prove by and bye, it neither did nor could, consistently with the promises of Christ and with our creed;—Luther and his jarring fellow-gospellers too, were much more liable themselves to error, and consequently, —to follow their new-invented system of religion, much more unsafe.

Of Indulgences.

An *indulgence*, in the ecclesiastical acceptance of the term, means a remission of the temporal punishment due to sin after the Divine pardon has been obtained by the sacrament of penance—as to the eternal punishment which awaited it in the life to come. This is a distinction which we find exemplified in the person of King David, and of the Israelites who perished in the wilderness, in consequence of their infidelities, which God had pardoned upon their repentance and at the instance of his servant Moses, but still rigorously executed upon them his threat of a general exclusion from the Land of Promise, on account of the self-same prevarications, &c.

As our Blessed Redeemer imparted only to the pastors of the church the power of remitting sin, to them exclusively it appertains, to enjoin to sinners appropriate works of penitence or satisfaction—in proportion to their wants, or the grievousness of their crimes; and there may exist also, sufficient reasons for occasionally diminishing the severity, or limiting the duration of such penalties. Hence it becomes the duty of the sovereign pontiff and the other prelates of the church to accord indulgences. Of this we have a remarkable instance in the conduct of St Paul towards the incestuous Corinthian, c. 5, 1 Cor. and ii. Cor. c. 2, v. 10. The church through every succeeding age has continued to adopt in practice the condescendence of the apostle. This fact is too notorious to admit being called in question; and even protestants have approved it in the primitive church, while they affect to reprobate it in the church of Rome. They reason ill. For the very establishment of canonical injunctions, is an invincible argument against them—of the belief which the church had ever retained, that after the remission of the *eternal* guilt of sin, together with its *eternal* punishment, the sinner notwithstanding, is obliged to satisfy the Divine justice by

temporary expiations. If then he should neglect to discharge the obligation here, he must of course pay off the debt hereafter. Consequently, he cannot be acquitted validly on earth, without reaping the advantage of this indulgence also in a future state. If once you grant that the sinner, at his departure hence indebted to the Divine justice for venial offences, is liable to suffer temporary pain, (for none can enter heaven defiled with the smallest stain of sin) and that he may be relieved by the prayers and suffrages of the church, why not allow that they may prove beneficial to his soul, and release him eventually from his sufferings?

Nor have the popes, as some have misconceived, deprived the bishops of the privilege of granting indulgences; but the church has wisely reserved to them exclusively, the power of according plenary indulgences in favor of the entire body of the faithful; because they alone have jurisdiction over the universal church. There are circumstances in which it is meet, that all true believers throughout the universe, concur unanimously in offering prayers and good works, with a view to obtain of Almighty God his abundant graces, in behalf of the whole catholic community. To whom, we wish to know, does it more properly appertain to invite them to this pious harmony, than to the Father and Pastor of the universal church? We do not deny, that there have existed abuses in these latter ages, greater than existed in the primitive times. But, to correct abuses, we must not combat them with the arguments of sophism and false reasoning, nor with observations equally devoid of piety, of justice, and of truth. These, in fact, were the unhallowed weapons with which Luther and Calvin, in declaiming against abuses—attempted to subvert the the unity of the catholic faith. Indulgences, it is true, had been too lavishly dispensed: it was easy to retrench the redundancy: but as their origin was laudable, the things themselves should have been suffered to remain inviolate. General indulgences, like those termed Jubilees, which powerfully recommend to the faithful—the worthy participation of the sacraments,—the doing of alms,—fasting and similar public acts of virtue, are indisputably a public good. Even at Paris, the very centre of incredulity and vice, infidel philosophy itself was compelled to acknowledge—the salutary effects of the last christian jubilee.

Nothing can be more reasonable than the decree of the council of Trent relating to indulgences (Sess. 25.) “As the power of according indulgences,” says the synod, “was by Jesus Christ entrusted to his church which, from its very origin, has been always in the habit of using this divine commission, the sacred council declares and formally defines, that this usage ought to be preserved as beneficial to christian people, and confirmed by preceding councils; and it pronounces anathema to all those who pretend that indulgences are unprofitable, or that the

church is not authorised to grant them. It desires nevertheless, that in granting them due moderation be observed, conformably with the laudable practice established from time immemorial in the church; lest a too great facility in granting them should enfeeble ecclesiastic discipline. In regard of the abuses which have crept in, and have given a handle to false teachers to declaim against *indulgences*, the sacred council with the design to correct them, ordains by the present decree, in the first place—that every species of sordid profit be removed: it enjoins the bishops to notice whatever abuses they shall discover in their dioceses, to denounce them to their provincial council, and afterwards to the sovereign pontiff,” &c.

By an *indulgence of forty days*, &c. we understand—the remission of a penalty equivalent to a course of penitence for forty days, &c. prescribed by the ancient canons; and by a plenary indulgence—the remission of all the punishment prescribed by these penitential canons for every kind of spiritual delinquency. But it is not by any means a releasement from the obligation of doing penance; which is universally binding upon all the faithful—*unless you do penance, you shall all alike perish.* (St Matt.)

Luther and those who adhere to the confession of Augsbourg, pretend, that the efficacy of the sacraments depends on the faith of the receiver; that they were instituted solely to nourish our faith, and that they do not confer grace even upon those that oppose no obstacle to prevent it. The catholic church has always taught the reverse of this doctrine, and has invariably ascribed to the sacraments a real efficacy; a virtue productive of sanctification: whoever is acquainted with the writings of the fathers, must allow this to be incontestible. Nor is it hard to comprehend that, as the grace which sanctifieth, is a gift of the Holy Ghost, God should have decreed to grant this grace, this gift of the Holy Ghost—to none but the worthy receivers of the sacraments. Thus would sanctifying grace be attached to the application of the sign; and consequently, this sign would of itself produce a sanctifying grace as its instrumental cause—whether morally or physically, is a mere scholastic dispute. The church, however, does not teach that proper dispositions are unnecessary in the receiver, but that these dispositions are no more than the conditions required in a person actually to receive grace, and not that grace is annexed to the conditions themselves as to its cause: thus in order to see, it is a necessary condition to have eyes; but although a person have eyes, he sees not in the dark; he must have light too, which alone is properly the cause of vision. This is precisely what we understand by the school terms *ex opere operato*—in contra-distinction to those others equally in use with theologians—*ex opere operantis*.

Such is the doctrine of christian antiquity regarding the holy sacraments. The catholic church has always numbered seven;

Luther and his Augsbourg confessionals only three ; the protestants of England two. All the schismatical churches separated from the church of Rome ever since the birth of Arianism, to this present day, maintain seven sacraments with the catholics of all ages, as may be seen in the articles of EUTYCHIANS, NESTORIANS, GREEKS, ARMENIANS, COPHTS, ABYSSINIANS, &c. Consequently, the doctrine of the catholic church touching the sacraments—was not introduced by the Roman pontiffs, as the enemies of catholicity would fain persuade their readers.

Catholics, moreover, ascribe to three of the sacraments, namely, baptism, confirmation and order—a character, or kind of indelible mark in the soul, permanently inherent. The disputes of theologians respecting the nature of this character, do not render its existence dubious, as Fra Paolo would insinuate. With equal reason might one call in question the existence of any phenomenon in nature, though universally admitted ; merely because naturalists disagree in their mode of explaining it. Catholic antiquity also has ever taught the reverse of the reforming doctrine concerning the proper minister of the sacraments. Luther and his followers pretend—not only that each individual among the faithful is the legitimate minister of all the sacraments indiscriminately, but even that those which were administered only in jest, and upon the stage, were not less true and valid sacraments than those conferred with due solemnity in the churches. This palpable absurdity the catholic church in like manner rejected and condemned.

The controversy relating to the sacrifice of the mass, according to the just remark of the great Bossuet, should stand or fall with that of the real presence. For as the votaries of the reformation scruple not to offer to God the Father, his Son Jesus Christ as present to their faith ; if they believed him present in reality, they surely would not hesitate to offer him to his eternal Father as really present. Now this true and real presence of our Redeemer in the eucharist is actually admitted by the Lutherans—in opposition to the Sacramentarians : against whom see the article BERENGARIUS. Luther, in abolishing private masses, did not suppress the mass itself. He did no more than introduce a few alterations. The abolition of private masses, if we are to credit Luther himself, was the fruit of a conference which he had with the devil, who, he candidly acknowledges, convinced him of the necessity of abolishing them. See this extraordinary adventure related at large in Luther's own words in his work *Upon the Private Mass*. If any of our readers wish to have the doctrine of the *Real Presence* as professed even by the church of England, more fully discussed, the learned Dr Hawarden will give them complete satisfaction in his second volume of *the Church of Christ*, on the article TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

The grounds upon which protestants have separated from the catholic church—inadmissible.

The errors and corruptions which Luther and his fellow reformers alleged against the church of Rome, as the causes of their separation, we have fully proved, were false charges and the grossest misrepresentations; as will appear from the perusal of the present article and those of—CATHOLICS, BERENGARIUS, ZUINGLIUS, AERIUS, JOVINIANISTS, ICONOCLASTS, &c. &c. Even the most enlightened among the protestant writers themselves, have been compelled to acknowledge, that this church taught no fundamental error. See Tillotson's *Serm. ii. p. 71*; Chillingworth's *Protestant Religion*, &c.

“ But although, by an impossible supposition, it could be proved—that the catholic church was heretical and idolatrous, the reformers still would not be justified in the attempt to establish a *new* ministry, or to usurp the functions of the ministry already established; the usurpation of the pastoral charge—without mission either ordinary or extraordinary—being always criminal, and in all circumstances absolutely inexcusable. It is presumptuously arrogating to oneself—that which is the gift of God alone, and which none can lawfully receive but from his hand. Nor has he any where revealed that in the new law, after the first establishment of his church, he would ever communicate the pastoral power by any other way, than by the channel of succession. Consequently, none can be assured of ever having received it, but through the medium of this legitimate succession; and those who have assumed it otherwise, are notoriously usurpers. To be forcibly convinced of this truth, we have only to take a retrospective view of the predicament, in which the reformed were placed, in the ideas of their very ministers: it was no other than that of converts from heresy. They had been adorers of the Host: they had invoked the saints, and venerated their relics; they had afterwards relinquished this practice: they were by consequence become orthodox by a change of sentiment; and such precisely are denominated converted heretics. But every heretic by the very profession of heresy forfeits the right—of exercising *legitimately* the functions annexed to the orders previously received, although he still retains the power of exercising them *validly*. The lawful exercise of his authority is suspended ipso facto, till his reconciliation with the church. But, to what church have the reformed been ever reconciled? Evidently to none at all. So far from it, they established new raised communions by their own private authority, without giving themselves the trouble to examine—whether there existed not a true church, to which they were

obliged to be united in faith. Nor can their pretensions to an *extraordinary* mission be, on any warrantable grounds, admitted. An extraordinary vocation must be proved by miracles; and, unfortunately, the reformers can produce no miracles to attest the justice of their claims. Hence—the inference is plain as demonstration—they have erected a church without authority; consequently, they are schismatics, since they have relinquished a society which was in possession of the ministry, and from which they have received no mission.” *Mr Johnson’s Vindication, in reply to Dr Porteus.*

Of the rule of faith.

Luther and his fellow reformers will have holy scripture to be the *sole* rule of faith; and “the late Dr Porteus, bishop of London, asserts,” says Mr Johnson in his *Vindication*, “that the scriptures contain a full and clear account of christianity, written by the very apostles and first disciples of our Lord himself, honestly delivered down into our hands.” (Page 6 of his pretended *Confutation of the Errors of the Church of Rome*.) This would be much to the purpose if clearly proved from scripture alone; but when, for the chief proof of one part of that assertion, we are referred to the general consent of christians to hand down the sacred books to us—with an assurance of their being entire, inspired, uncorrupted and duly translated, (*ibid*, p. 3, 4, 5, &c.) this looks so very like giving up the assertion, that the confuter wishes to put a bar to the consequences of that way of reasoning, by telling us, that “protestants receive scripture by no means upon the authority of tradition *merely*.” (p. 9.) But if not upon the authority of TRADITION *merely*; therefore—not upon the authority of SCRIPTURE *merely*: by consequence, scripture *alone* does not lay the FIRST FOUNDATION of our knowledge of christianity.

How then is it possible the scriptures should contain a full and clear account of christianism? “Protestants,” resumes Dr Porteus, “receive the scripture *partly* on account of its own reasonableness, and the characters of Divine wisdom in it; *partly* from the testimony which one part of it bears to the other;” but if only *partly* on these accounts, the authority of scripture is not learned from scripture *alone*. Besides, if this internal evidence of the integrity and the inspiration of scripture, be so glaring, that it is recognisable by every reader of the bible in the eighteenth century; how happened it that several books of scripture now received by protestants, were not accounted canonical by the whole church for some ages—till by a general consent of christians, concentrating the scattered rays of antiquity, they were at length received? (Walton, *Prolegom.*

c. 4, 56.) For, as to the testimony of Jews and heathens, whatever weight it may have, it is not scripture: so that this momentous, and, in the protestant creed, this fundamental article—the canon of the sacred books—cannot by human art be accurately learned from scripture *alone*: consequently, the scriptures do not contain a full account of christianity.” Ibid.

“ When we have agreed what is scripture—what not; we would wish to be informed—in what book of holy writ we read a full and clear account of infant baptism, or of the obligation of keeping holy the Sunday? The institution of baptism recorded Matt. 28, 19, leaves it wholly undetermined—whether infants ought or ought not to be baptised. If all must be *instructed* before baptism, as the text seems to indicate, (Matt. 28) infants then are positively excluded from the benefit of that sacrament. But if *instruction* be not always requisite before the ministration of baptism, where is this exemption in favour of infants expressed, in any plain text of scripture? That there is no exemption, would rather appear from Mar. xvi. 16, Acts ii. 38, viii. 37, and 1. Pet. iii. 21. It is true, we are told, Mar. x. that infants came to our Saviour; not however, to be christened, but to receive his blessing. (See Mat. xix. 13.) If heaven be for such, (Mar. x.) might not the reason be—because infants are an emblem of humble christians. (Matt. xviii. 3, 4.) If baptism seem to be a necessary condition of salvation, Jo. iii. 5, does not faith appear to be equally required, Mar. xvi. 16. In short, if we read in scripture of whole families being baptised, we do not read that there was one infant in any of those families, nor any clear proof that if there had been, they would have been baptised.” Ibid.

“ With regard to the obligation of keeping holy the Sunday, we cannot even learn from scripture alone—with any certainty—which day of the week is Sunday. The Sabbath mentioned in the ten commandments (Exod. xx. and Deut. v.) was not Sunday, but Saturday. Now it will be allowed by protestants as well as catholics, that the commandments are approved by the gospel, as to all moral and natural duties: we should therefore be inclined to infer, that the Saturday ought to be kept holy, did we not borrow our light in this instance from some other source than scripture. Nor should we be of course exempt from the obligation of sanctifying the Saturday too, although from scripture alone a proof might be made out for the obligation of sanctifying the Sunday. This, however, is not the case; for the Lord’s-day mentioned Rev. 1, does not necessarily designate the Sunday in particular, rather than any other day of the week; nor do the circumstances of breaking bread (Acts xx.) and collecting alms on the first day of the week, prove it to have been a holiday. For we know that the disciples *broke bread* daily: (Acts ii.) nor is charity to

the necessitous a sufficient mark of a holiday—among *good* christians.”

“ To lay aside infant baptism as unnecessary, and to neglect the religious observation of the Sunday, would be an unsufferable liberty even in the judgment of protestants, although these things are in no part of scripture clearly expressed: even with protestants, they are important points of christian faith and conduct. Therefore the obscure manner, in which these and many other not inconsiderable articles, relating both to faith and morals, are expressed in scripture, as well as the total neglect of all the sacred writers to give us an exact canon of holy writ, and an evident mark of every inspired text is a convincing proof—that the scriptures were not designed to contain a full and clear account of christianity, nor, consequently, to be the *only* rule of faith.”—Mr JOHNSON’S Vindication, c. 1.

Apostolical tradition one part of the rule of faith.

“ Whether the apostles *could* have written a full and competent rule of faith, if God had so directed,—is a question perfectly irrelevant to the point in debate. The fact is, they had no such commission. The precept of their divine master enjoined them—to *preach the gospel to every creature*, and to *teach them to observe all things whatsoever he had commanded*. (Mar. xvi. 15. Mat. xxviii. 20.) SS. Andrew, and James the son of Zebedee, with other apostles who never wrote at all, but only delivered the truths of the gospel by tradition, complied, we presume, with the full import of their commission, not less than others of the sacred college, who did leave some instructions in writing. Hence it follows, that if none of the apostles or disciples of Christ had committed any thing to writing, the injunction given them to teach all nations, and to transmit their doctrine to the latest posterity—even unto the consummation of the world, (Mat. xxviii.) would still have been observed: all necessary knowledge would have been conveyed safe to the most distant ages—through the channel of tradition. Where then is the necessity of exploding tradition, as a thing which could not long afford us in the ideas of Dr Porteus (p. 6, &c.) any security of the truth? It must be owned, says the bishop, that our Saviour delivered his doctrine to the apostles, and they to all the world—by word of mouth, and that this way of delivery at first was sufficient; (and why not still sufficient?) and that therefore, continues he, St Paul exhorts the Thessalonians, to hold fast the traditions he had taught them;—whether by word or by writing,” (2 Thess. ii. 14.) “ Some traditions Christ himself, and his apostles, recommended, though they condemned such human inventions as are contrary to revealed truths. (Mar. vii. Col. ii.) But if some

traditions were then approved, why may not they be still approved? Where does our Saviour or St Paul insinuate, that the oral communication of the unwritten traditions, should be authorised only during the first age? Does not the apostle rather, plainly intimate that the same method of conveyance was to be continued in all succeeding generations, when he says to his disciple Timothy; *the things which thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who MAY BE ABLE TO TEACH OTHERS ALSO*, (2 Tim. ii. 2.) Is it one iota more impossible to convey safe to posterity, the apostolical creed, and some few other short instructions, than to deliver entire and uncorrupted the several books of the Old and New Testament? The apostle's creed and all necessary doctrines were remembered—even in the tenth and other contiguous *dark ages*;—else how come we by them in the nineteenth? If in the conveyance of tradition much depend on the sincerity and truth of persons liable to ignorance and other worse qualities (p. 8. Confut.) is not equal dependence on persons of similar character requisite in the conveyance of holy writ? Great dependence on the authority of others is clearly unavoidable—by all who do not read the Bible in the original languages; the New Testament in Greek, the Old in Hebrew, Chaldaic, &c. Even they who apply their study to Oriental tongues, must yet rely on the skill and honesty of many persons, not only in consulting grammars, lexicons and masters; but in reading only transcripts taken by we know not how many different hands, or copies frequently altered by ignorant, blundering or malicious writers and printers. Therefore the tradition of all necessary points of doctrine might pass with equal safety, as the knowledge of the sacred books,—through the several ages preceding the reformation, when the catholic religion was much more widely extended. So that the hard words *popish tyranny and darkness* (p. 6. *ibid*) can fall only on catholic countries in modern times. Yet the very mob would acquit them of the charge—of being more ignorant than their ancestors; and the learned are well apprized, that sound criticism and a sagacious detection of impositions, are now not less attended to by catholics on the continent, than among protestants in the British isles.”

“The scriptures indeed, while they retain that purity which catholic approved editions actually do retain at present, but of which we have no security for future times, are allowed to be a great help to preserve untainted the depositum of faith, and the chief rule whereby articles of faith may be determined. But they are not the *whole* rule of christian faith; they are not the *only* channel through which we receive the doctrines of eternal life. They were not the only channel of divine faith in the beginning of christianity; the church was christian before the New Testament was committed to writing at all, as is confessed

by all parties. Nor can they even at this day, be the *only* channel of divine faith to the greatest part of christians ; since far the greatest part have already settled their notions on religious subjects at an early period of life,—either before they were in a capacity to read the scriptures, or at least before they were at all qualified to collect the system of christianity from scripture alone. They cannot be the only channel of divine faith with regard to infant baptism, and other points not clearly contained in holy writ. All this even prejudice the most besotted must acknowledge. Nor do persons in power generally allow individuals full liberty to collect their faith from scripture alone, although, consistently with protestant principles, this should be granted to all indiscriminately. Canons, articles, and restraining constitutions, are a standing demonstration against protestants, that tradition is even with them an integral part of the rule of faith. Hence the *whole* rule of faith and morals—is scripture *and* apostolical tradition. If it be urged that ‘ tradition is fallible,’ (Confut. p. 9) True ; unless recommended by infallible authority : without this, we are not able to distinguish with absolute certainty, genuine apostolical tradition from that which is spurious, nor, sometimes, to discern with certainty the sense of that which is acknowledged genuine. But as much may be said of the books of holy writ ; as appears from what has been already proved. Indeed genuine apostolical tradition is allowed by the author of the Confutation (page 7) after St Paul, to have been of no less authority than the written word ; and this is all that catholics contend for. So that the very objection levelled at the authority of tradition, does not at all weaken the conclusion already drawn—that apostolical tradition is *one* part of the rule of faith and life, scripture and apostolical tradition the *whole* rule. It merely shews the necessity of an authoritative interpreter of that rule, or the necessity of a judge qualified to determine with certainty, where may be found, and what is the sense of—the rule of faith and morals. This judge is the catholic church of God ; as we shall now proceed to demonstrate.”

Who is the judge and authoritative interpreter of the rule of faith and morals ?

“ That the catholic church is this authoritative interpreter will manifestly appear, first, if we consider this church as an illustrious society ; secondly, if we reflect upon the privilege of infallibility promised to it by our Blessed Redeemer ; thirdly, if we attend to this same privilege easily deduced from the apostle’s creed. The catholic church in the first place, considered merely as an illustrious society, has the least exceptionable title to be the authoritative interpreter of the rule of faith ; as will appear

from the following argument :—Whatever deference may be due to the judgment of each private individual upon matters spiritual, the same is due in a greater degree to a decision of several pastors of the church, and that in proportion to the numbers uniting in this decision ; pre-supposing knowledge and abilities not unequal. Hence the opinion of one private person must be a far less weighty evidence, than the determination of a whole national church ; and this determination an evidence far less momentous, than the solemn decision of the pastors of the catholic church collectively ; especially as church pastors decide upon a point which, of all mankind, they are most likely to understand. To appeal from the united decision of the pastors of the church on a point of faith, cannot be less unreasonable in the nature of things, than to appeal from the uniform opinion of lawyers on a point of law, or from the judgment of physicians unanimously, on a medical subject. Every one would condemn the temerity of private judgment in opposition to such authority, in these instances. If then the deliberate determination of the general voice of church pastors—be not of itself absolutely infallible, (for, considering such a decision in itself, or in its own nature, is considering it independently of the promises of Christ ;) yet, would wisdom venture to oppose such an authority ?—There are moreover several corroborating circumstances, which concur to ensure to that authority a still more irresistible force of credibility. The present decisions of the church, have also the advantage of long prescription ; even protestants allow them a quiet possession of many centuries before Luther. “ Laity and clergy, learned and unlearned, all ages, sects and degrees of men, women and children of whole Christendom (a horrible and most dreadful thing to think, and not less blasphemous to say) have been at once, say they, drowned in abominable idolatry, of all other vices most detested by God, and damnable to man, and that by the space of eight hundred years and more :” (it might with equal truth have said eight thousand.) *See Book of Homilies approved by the 35th article of religion, part 3.* “ How strikingly probable will all this appear, if we attend to the nature of the Divine perfections ;—infinite goodness ; infinite sanctity ; infinite truth ;—that God should abandon his church in the very sink of impious errors for a series of ages !!! During these identical ages—this same poor abandoned church was in vain attacked by the united malice of tyrants, traitors, infidels and heretics ; all raging with fury to undermine and subvert her, all equally foiled in their atrocious attempt ! Instead of succumbing under the combined efforts of her mortal enemies, she always enjoyed the special blessing of Providence ; was constantly supported by the learned writings of eminent doctors ; confirmed by the Divine testimony of miracles ; sanctified by the heroic virtues of numberless saints ; illustrated by

the blood of many martyrs, and embellished with the admirable purity of thousands of holy virgins. Even at this day, while the pretended reformation is every where disturbed with multiplied dissensions, unceasing variations and perpetual revolts; while it is branded by its very friends with unbridled lust and sacrilege in its origin, and with the most ungodly rapaciousness, instead of religious motives for its change of tenets—(see Heylin Hist. of the Reform. p. 2. Collier Eccles. Hist. vol ii. p. 23, &c.)—the catholic church, unalterable in its doctrines, unblemished in its moral principles, uninterrupted in the orderly succession of its pastors, still embraces the greatest part of christian nations within its pale. Now if each of these circumstances taken separately, carry not along with them full conviction, they are—at least when combined—an incontestible evidence; they render that society called the catholic church so illustrious, and give its testimony such preponderance, that it cannot in reason be rejected. Hence, upon the authority of this illustrious society, we doubt not to admit the authenticity of the scriptures themselves; nor could the first reformers have any other evidence of nearly equal force. Upon the very same authority on which both catholics and the first reformers received the scriptures, catholics at this present day receive also—*apostolical tradition*; and with equal reason—since the same authority is in both cases of equal weight. Here therefore, we fix our foot. If upon the well-grounded authority of that illustrious society called the catholic church—we may safely take our *rule of faith and practice*, we may likewise upon the same well-grounded authority—safely take the *sense* of that rule.” Ibid.

“ Moreover, that Christ has promised to his church the privilege of infallibility, with relation to points of faith and the principles of good morals, we prove from the following words of our blessed Redeemer—*Upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it*, (Mat. xvi. 18.) From this text catholics conclude, that the church shall not err in faith, and shall teach no other than sound principles of morals; and consequently, that the church is in these respects infallible. We must of necessity admit either this exposition, or the exposition of some private person, or of some national church, or of some assembly or other greatly inferior to the illustrious society of the catholic church, which adopts the explanation above; that is to say, we must otherwise admit an evidence which is not undeniable, against an evidence which is undeniable. Nor do we thus assert, that the infallible authority of the church proves its own infallibility from scripture, as the Confutation insinuates, (p. 12.) We only maintain, that the authority of the illustrious society called the church, which in other instances is allowed to be undeniable, should be allowed to be undeniable in this instance also—of a similar nature, in proving from scripture its just claims

to infallibility. So that the church, though not of its own nature absolutely infallible, proves its accidental infallibility—from the promises of Christ. For, to be *not of itself infallible*, and yet to be infallible by virtue of the promise of Christ, are two things very different, and very consistent the one with the other.” Ibid.

“ From other texts of scripture, catholics demonstrate, that a charter of infallibility was granted by our Saviour to his church; for instance, among many others, from Mat. xviii. 17. For, supposing even—with the bishop of London, p. 13, 14, a particular church to be there spoken of; when a particular church agrees with the catholic church, and composes private contestations by catholic principles, it constitutes itself a part of the catholic church, and therefore is equally to be *heard*—on pain of the refractory party being looked upon *as a heathen man and a publican*. The same prerogative of infallibility we also prove from Mat. xxviii. 19, 20. For the commission itself here given to the apostles to teach and baptize, is not more plain, than the promise of perpetual assistance in the execution of that commission, by the apostles and their successors the pastors of the church, till the end of time.—It should also be observed, that these and many other texts of scripture,” (Jo. xiv. 16, 17; xvi. 13; 1 Tim. iii. 15, &c.) from which “ catholics infer, that Christ and his Holy Spirit will always protect his church from error, mutually confirm and support each other.” Ibid.

“ If private persons with his Lordship of London, p. 19, stand forth against what they think vain pretensions to infallibility, because St John bids us *try the Spirits*, 1 Jo. iv. 1, and because St Paul tells us to *prove all things*, 1 Thess. v. 21,—how, we ask, can we prove or try spiritual matters better, in the opinion of the apostles themselves, than by submitting the determination of them to the pastors of the church whom God gave, as St Paul avers, to prevent our being any more tossed to and fro, and carried about by every wind of doctrine? (Ephes. iv. 11, 16.) Is not this a more prudent method, than to leave the unlearned and the unstable, who wrest the scriptures to their own destruction, (2 Pet. iii. 16) to decide by scripture what they are totally unqualified to do, with the evident risk of their eternal salvation? This rule St John himself prescribes. Should it be alleged that the Jewish synagogue had a stronger title to infallibility than the christian church, this will hardly be maintained when what is said in Deutronomy xvii. 8, &c. is diligently compared with Col. iii. 20, unless we be obliged to think our parents also, infallible: and when Ps. cxviii. 22, quoted and applied to the Jewish priests, Mat. xxi. 42, 45, has been collated with Mat. x. 16, 18, where something much more favorable is asserted in regard of the catholic church. But whether the Jewish church was or was not infallible before the coming of Christ, is a matter of no great moment to us, who by the grace of God are

not Jews. Had Christ cautioned us as earnestly against the leaven of the false doctrine of the pastors of the church, as he cautioned his disciples against the leaven of the Pharisees, (Mat. xvi. 6, 12,) we should have found as many exceptions in Mat. xvi. 18; as we do now in Mat. xxiii. 3; especially if miracles like those of Christ had been wrought by the opponents of church pastors: for the miraculous operations of Christ ought, surely, to have convinced the Jews that they were to listen to Him, rather than their jealous priesthood." Ibid.

"But may not some of the members of the church be defiled by sin without falsifying what is said Matt. xvi. 18? They may. Some of them also may be deformed by latent error, skulking in the darkness of duplicity and subtile evasion, without any infringement of that charter of infallibility which Christ promised to the pastors of his church in general. (P. 13, Confut.) But neither can error deform the generality of the pastors—for that would falsify the promise of Christ; nor can sin defile the whole church—for that would render it absolutely unlike its description in the gospel. (Matt. iii. 12, xiii. 47, 48, 49.) It will always have *wheat* together with the *chaff*, and *good fish* with the *bad*, till the destined separation at the end of time. Besides, though Christ has privileged the pastors of his church in general with a special exemption from error, he has nowhere promised them the like special exemption from sin."

"To every objection drawn from sacred writ, this one answer may suffice;—that all such expositions of scripture are contrary to the expositions of the catholic church, and therefore inadmissible. For the authority of the church must either be allowed as undeniable in things of this nature, or (it has been proved)—we forfeit our title to the scripture itself. This ought abundantly to satisfy those who admit scripture exclusively, as the rule of faith. But if any thing be still wanting completely to vindicate the church's claim of infallibility, let our readers but recite the profession of faith—in general use among christians and commonly called the apostle's creed. For whether this creed was framed by the apostles themselves or not, it is allowed by protestants—to contain a summary abridgment of their doctrine. Protestants also grant, that the creed always was, is, and will be true; and that therefore there always was from the time of the apostles, is now, and always will be, a holy catholic church, and a communion of saints. (See Pearson's Exposition of the Creed on the ninth article.) Now a church cannot be holy and a communion of saints, if it teach impious errors, superstitions and idolatry: no; it cannot be holy and a communion of saints, if it require all persons in its communion to believe erroneous doctrines, in lieu of the doctrine of our Saviour Christ. Therefore the holy catholic church can never err

against faith. Consequently, its privilege of infallibility is fairly deducible from the creed." Ibid.

" This reasoning is so plain and obvious ; so adequate to the capacity of the most illiterate, that we have great cause to thank Providence, for favoring the church with this article in our daily profession of faith. The caviller may here raise mists by forced constructions ; but forced constructions have nothing to do in the exposition of a creed—which was designed by its framers to be the instruction of every person of common sense. The obvious meaning of this article must be its true meaning ; and that obvious meaning will always prove the catholic church—to subsist,—to be infallible in faith, and to be the authoritative interpreter of the rule of faith and morals. And as no other church or body of men can justly claim a like degree of infallibility, the catholic church alone is this interpreter, and the lawful judge of controversies concerning religion. Let each one then diligently enquire (and this enquiry is by no means difficult, as will clearly appear from the perusal of what we have already said)—what it is that constitutes the whole rule of faith and conduct, and—who has the best title to be the interpreter of that rule ; and then humbly submit to be instructed and directed in christian faith and morality, by the interpretation thus obtained." Ibid. Whoever does this will act most rationally, and soon arrive at the *light of truth*.

M

MACEDONIANS—followers of Macedonius who in the fourth age denied the divinity of the Holy Ghost. This man in 332 was placed in the see of Constantinople by the Arian faction, whose errors he had espoused ; and his intrusion was attended with tumult and much bloodshed. The violences which he committed, compelled the emperor Constantius—though himself an Arian, to remove him ; and Macedonius was, in consequence, deposed by a council of that sect held at Constantinople in the year 359. Incensed alike at his fellow sectarists and the catholics, he now maintained against the former—the divinity of the Son of God, and against the latter he asserted—that the Holy Ghost was not a Divine Person, but merely a creature more perfect than the rest. The objections from Holy Scripture which the Arians brought forward against the divinity of the Son, were the greatest part of them employed by Macedonius against the divinity of the Third Person : his error was the dictate of revenge, and the suggestion of a proud and contumacious spirit.

However, he prevailed with certain Arian bishops who had been deposed like himself, to make common cause; and they found means to propagate their heterodox opinions—in Thrace, in the province of the Hellespont, and in Bithynia. They imposed upon the people by an affected gravity in their exterior, and the austerity of their manners—a usual artifice with false teachers, or in other words, of *wolves in sheep's cloathing*. The Macedonians were tolerated by Julian the apostate, and by his catholic successor Jovian: but the Arian emperor Valens persecuted both them and the catholics, with whom the Macedonians one while appeared disposed to enter into terms of communion. In 381 they were invited to the general synod at Constantinople, convened by Theodosius—with a view to the restoration of peace to the distracted church: on this occasion they refused to sign the Nicene symbol; and were condemned as heretics. From that period we find no farther mention of them in ecclesiastic history.

The errors of the Macedonians in reference to the Third Person of the most blessed Trinity, differ in this from those of the Socinians: the latter, with the sectarists of Photinus, hold that the Holy Ghost is not a Person, but merely a denominative term signifying the operations of the Divinity within our soul: the Macedonians, on the contrary, held the Holy Ghost to be a person,—a real subsisting being,—a created spirit—resembling the angels, but of a nature far superior to their's, although greatly inferior to the Godhead. We will endeavour, with the help of God, to demonstrate against these ancient as well as our more modern Anti-trinitarians—the divinity of this Holy Spirit.

“ Christ our Lord, before his ascension into heaven, commissioned his apostles to go and preach to all nations the adorable mystery of the Trinity, and to baptize those who should believe in him—in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. (Matt. xxviii. 19.) These words alone should be sufficient to confound—the Arians, the Socinians, and all other—ancient or modern—enemies of this fundamental article of the christian faith. Reason, indeed, cannot comprehend this sublime mystery, as Christ himself sufficiently declares, (Matt. xi. 27; xvi. 17;) and to affirm it to be demonstrable by the aid of reason alone, as Abelard and some moderns have pretended, is not only an error, but evidently absurd. Almighty God, in condescension to human weakness, was pleased to prepare the world gradually to receive this and his other most profound mysteries. The incarnation of the Son of God cannot be understood without faith in the most Blessed Trinity; and Christ himself has often expressly inculcated it in the New Testament, in which we read at every turn—of three distinct subsisting persons in the Godhead; and St John informs us that—*there are three in heaven that give testimony.*

(1 John, v. 7.) This must mean—not a moral union, but a strict unity of the Divine nature in them, as other texts plainly prove. By the above is implied a real distinction of the persons: for *one* who should bear testimony by distinct properties alone, could not constitute *three* witnesses, as St John says there are, in the Godhead. The Socinians grant the Son to be a witness distinct from the Father, and even pretend him to be—so far distinct, as not to be of the same Divine nature with him, but a mere man. It is then an inconsistency in them to term the Holy Ghost a mere property of the Father, not distinct from him. For he is no less mentioned in this and in several other places of the New Testament as a real subsisting person, than the Son; for instance, in the form of baptism. We cannot be baptised in the name of a simple quality. The Holy Ghost *teaches*, (John xiv. 15)—*gives evidence*, (John xv. 26)—*reveals hidden things*, (1 Tim. iv. 1)—*searches the secret things of God*, (1 Cor. xi. 10)—*operates, and divides the gifts of God as he pleases*, (1 Cor. xiii. 11)—*proceeds from the Father*, (John xiv. 16, xv. 26, 27) *appears* in a visible form, (Matt. iii. 17; Acts ii. 3.) Now actions like the above cannot with any propriety be ascribed to mere properties, but to persons alone. Moreover, the Holy Ghost is called Jehovah, or the Great God. (Isa. vi. 9. Acts xxviii. 25. Acts v. 3. Matt. xii. 32.) The incommunicable essential attributes of God belong to Him—as *immensity*, (Wisdom i. 7. Ps. cxxxviii. 7. 1 Cor. iii. 16 and 11. 2 Cor. xiii. 13)—*Omniscience*, (John xvi. 13. 1 Cor. ii. 10)—*Omnipotence*, (Ps. xxxii. 6. Luke i. 35)—*Creation*, (Gen. i. 2. Ps. xxxii. 6)—*Conservation of creatures*, (Ps. ciii. 30)—*Miracles*, (Matt. xii. 28. 1 Cor. xii. 4)—*The Conception of Christ*, (Luke i. 35)—*His Unction and Mission*, (Isa. lxi. 1) *The Forgiveness of sins*, (1 Cor. vii. 11)—*The Government of the Church*, (Acts xiii. 2. xv. 28)—*The conferring of Gifts*, (1 Cor. xii. 7)—*Sanctification of Souls*, (Ephes. i. 17. 2 Thess. xi. 13. 1 Pet. i. 2)—*The diffusion of Charity*, (Rom. v. 5)—*The resurrection of the dead*, (Rom. viii. 2, &c.) What then is there wanting to this most Holy Spirit—to constitute his Divinity? Truly nothing; unless it be the consent of ancient and modern Anti-trinitarians. Messrs Whiston, Clarke, and the host of Socinian writers find a difficulty in *conceiving*—that which, in fact, is incomprehensible to the highest angels; and on this senseless plea, they impiously deny and reject the sacred mysteries of revealed religion, which those sublime spirits, with their countenances reverently veiled, adore. They are indeed revealed truths; but still, so *revealed*, as to remain obscure and impenetrable to all created understanding. God would be no longer infinite, if his Divine nature could be fathomed or described by any limited being, however perfect; much less by us mortals in our present imperfect state of trial, during which nothing can be more reason-

able or becoming, than the exercise of faith, and a sacrifice of our reason itself—captivated in submission to the word of God ; nothing more glorious to the Deity than our silent adoration of his incomprehensible nature and perfections.” (See the learned author of the *Moveable Feasts*, p. 584, &c.)

MAHOMET or MOHAMMED—originally a merchant in Arabia, began to publish his pretended revelations in the thirty-eighth year of his age, and the six hundredth and eighth of Jesus Christ. Some time after this, with the help of a Jew and a Nestorian monk, he compiled his *Alcoran* or *Coran*. It is an undigested heap of ridiculous absurdities. In proof of which it will abundantly suffice to instance his marvellous *Cock* ; whose size was so prodigious, that his feet standing on the first heaven, his head reached up to the second, at the distance of five hundred years journey—with other such arrant nonsense, too silly even to *amuse* our readers.

Mahomet engaged his wife and three of the principal inhabitants of Mecca,—Abubeker, Othman and Omar,—to embrace his extravagant system of religion, and called it *islam*, a term which, according to Dr Pocock, signifies *obedience to God and his prophet*. Hence his followers are distinguished to this day by the name of Moslem or Mussulmans. Mahomet however, met with opposition, and was obliged to consult his safety by flight. He retired to Yethreb ; where he had already many followers. This place, from the circumstance of the impostor's flight, took the name of *Medina t' Lnabi*, or the prophet's town. From this date—the 16th of July, 622, the Hejira of the Arabs, that is, the epocha from which the Mahometans compute their years, commenced. In 628, Mahomet was complimented with the title of Prophet, and declared chief, as well in civil as in religious matters. Soon after, he forced his old enemies the Coreishites to embrace his sect, together with the whole city of Mecca ; and before his death, which happened at Medina in the eleventh year of the Hejira, the twenty-third of Heraclius, and the six hundredth and thirty-second of Jesus Christ, he had subjugated a great part of Arabia. Abubeker, whose daughter he had married, held the sovereignty after him, with the title of *Caliph* or vicar of the prophet. He employed his forces in the conquest of Syria ; for Mahomet had commanded his followers to oblige all nations—to adopt his religion or—to pay tribute,—by force of arms, (*Alcoran*, c. ix. § 29. c. viii. § 40.) After many victories obtained over the armies of Heraclius, Abubeker by his generals reduced Damascus in 634, on the very day of his death, which happened at Medina. Omar, one of whose daughters had been married likewise to Mahomet, succeeded Abubeker. This prince took Jerusalem in 637, Antioch in 638, and Alexandria in 640, by his general Amrou. The reduction

of this city was followed by the conquest of all Egypt. A little while after the Caliph seized on Tripoli and almost all Barbary. In 641 one of his armies reduced Ispahan capital of Persia; and in the course of Othman's reign, who succeeded Omar in 643, all Persia submitted to the Saracen yoke. Thus did the Saracens in less than thirty years found an empire equal in extent to that of ancient Rome; God employing this savage people as a scourge wherewith to punish the sins of many nations. It was not long however, before this vast empire was dismembered, and divided into a multitude of independent kingdoms. Mahometism at this day is a superstition immensely extended—over Asia, Africa and a considerable part of Europe. See Mr Butler's *Lives of the Saints*, vol. 12. p. 414, 15.

The leading principles of Mahometanism are as follow—
 1. That God is but one. 2. That Mahomet is his prophet. 3. That angels are the ministers of God, and execute his commands; of whom the angel Gabriel is chief. 4. The Mahometans hold fate and absolute predestination. 5. They believe a heaven and a hell—with such rewards and punishments as Mahomet knew would make the deepest impression—upon those with whom he had to deal. Paradise, he said, abounded with pleasures and delights best suited to the palate of his Arabians: women ever young and beautiful; pleasant rivers and refreshing streams, cooling drinks, shaded gardens, delicious fruits—with an eternal enjoyment of all sensual satisfactions. And with the same kind of subtlety he formed their notions regarding hell. 6. The Mahometans practise circumcision, like the Jews. 7. Their religion is to be propagated by the instrumentality of the sword; for which reason their *Imans* or priests, as often as they preach, hold in their hand a *drawn sword*. 8. That the Mussulmans, in killing *unbelievers*, merit heaven. 9. Mahomet forbids wine, games of chance, &c. 10. He admits both the Old and New Testament, and quotes many passages from each, to justify his pretended *apostleship*. 11. His followers are allowed, not only a plurality of *wives*, but to keep as many women-slaves for concubines, as they are able to maintain; and the children of the latter are as legitimate as those of the former. Mahomet forbade indeed, adultery; but, by a special privilege granted him, he said, by Almighty God—in his nightly jaunt to heaven, he took to himself the wife of his domestic Zayd. 12. He teaches the immortality of the soul, but holds notwithstanding, that the punishments of the wicked are not eternal, and that the very demons themselves shall eventually be converted by the power of the *Coran*.

These, with innumerable other silly, false and ridiculously extravagant tenets and traditions, make up the bulk of Mahometan doctrines and practice:—a system of religion invented by an *illiterate barbarian*, who could neither write nor read,—

aided in his work of darkness by a renegado christian, and an apostate Jew ; and using as the means of its propagation the violence of persecution and the all-powerful eloquence of the sword. Seriously to undertake the refutation of a religion so licentious and impure, would be offering an affront to christianity, and an insult to common understanding.

MANICHEES—a numerous sect of heretics who derived their name from Manes or Manicheus. Scythianus—the first forger of the Manichean imposture, was a very rich merchant, well skilled in medicine, astronomy and the mathematics ; was a christian before his fall ; travelled into Egypt, and afterwards into Palestine ; and, at his death left his manuscripts to Manes : for he was his contemporary though senior, as appears from a letter which Manes wrote to him. A fragment of this letter was preserved by Photius, and published by Fabricius (Bib. Græc. T. 5, p. 283) : though some have made Scythianus much older. See St Cyril of Jerusalem, St Epiphanius, and Photius. Manes himself, according to St Ephrem, was born in Chaldea (hym. 14) in the year 240, as we are assured also by the chronicle of Edessa, published by Jos. Assemani (Bibl. Orient. T. 1. p. 393.) His name was Corbicius or Cubricus ; but he afterwards took that of Manes or Manicheus, probably the same with *Manaem* or *Manahem*, the Paraclete or Comforter. He was a christian, and had been ordained priest, as the learned Jacobite Abulpharagius, and the judicious D'Herbelot testify. For obstinately maintaining heterodox opinions he was excommunicated, and afterwards repaired to the court of the infidel king Sapor, son of Artaxerxes the founder of the second Persian monarchy. He lived in favor with this prince, and accompanied him in his wars, perhaps in quality of his physician, says Beausobre. He now renewed and perfected the system which he had formerly learned of Scythianus, blending in one religion many notions of heathenish philosophers, the Persian magians and the gospel. Pretending that all nations had had their respective prophets, he preferred those of the ancient Persians and the other Gentiles (meaning their philosophers) to those of the Hebrews, whom he rejected ; and he adopted the Magian notion of two First Principles, the one good and the other bad, for the ground or basis of his new religion. The Magians originally had established two co-eternal principles ; the one good or light, the other evil, and the author of all evil. It is certain, however, that the Persians never adored this evil principle, nor called it God ; though some Greek writers in their account of the Persian system, gave it that name. Some other idolaters had their *avenging* or malicious God, whom they fancied they appeased by sacrifices and supplications. From the acts of the Persian martyrs, and other

monuments, it notwithstanding appears, that the Magians in general worshipped all the four elements, as inferior deities. Zoroaster, the famed reformer of the ancient Persian religion, taught the resurrection of the dead, a heaven and a hell, with several other important and religious truths. But this philosopher was puzzled to account—how evil and its first principle did not come from God; since according to him, God formed both the good and the evil principle, the subaltern causes of all things—though not coëval; and Pocock observes—that upon this article the Magians were always much divided among themselves. There were among them above seventy sects, differing chiefly concerning the properties of this evil principle. Among these, some after Zoroaster's time adhered to the old Magian tenets, and were called Magusians, i. e. followers of the Magians. Manes approved this popular sect, the capital point of whose doctrine was, that the two principles of light and darkness are eternal and coëval, both necessarily existing and producing necessarily—all other things that are produced, good and bad. This was the origin of Manicheism. (See Scharistani, published by Hyde.)

Sapor and the reigning Zoroastrian Magians were much offended at the innovation of Manes, who pretended he had learned his new doctrine in an ecstasy, received his apostleship immediately from heaven, and was inspired by the Paraclete, whom Christ had promised from above. The king resolved to put him to death; which he prevented only by a timely flight. During his retreat, he composed his gospel (often quoted by the fathers) in a cave; as Zoroaster had compiled his Zend in solitude. Sapor I. died in 272; and his son Horinisdas secretly favored the pretended prophet. Manes, therefore, taking with him the book of his gospel, which he had adorned with excellent paintings, and in which he had written his own revelations, returned into Persia. The new king his protector did not reign quite two years, and his son Varanes first favored, but afterwards persecuted Manes, who was put to death, probably by him, though some think, by his adoptive son and successor Varanes II. This took place in the year 277.

Manes had twelve apostles. The three most noted ones were—Thomas, Abdas and Hermas. Another called Leucius wrote false acts of the apostles of Christ, and a book on the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin. The Manichees became a very numerous sect, and spread themselves in Persia, Mesopotamia, Syria, Egypt, Greece, Africa and Spain; and in the seventh century, in Armenia: afterwards in Bulgaria, Lombardy and Languedoc; but were every where the execration, equally of Pagans, Jews, Mahometans and Christians. The whole doctrine of Manes centered chiefly upon the distinction of the two principles of light and darkness, which had been first introdu-

ced among christians by the heresiarch Basilides. He had travelled into Persia, and dogmatized at Alexandria in the beginning of the second age. He is accused by the fathers; of practising the black art; and it is certain, that he taught many superstitious notions and ceremonies with reference to his Eons or angels. See the article BASILIDES.

Marcion his contemporary propagated the doctrine of two principles, in Pontus and at Rome; rejected the Old Testament, and denied the resurrection of the body. Bardesanes, previously a christian philosopher of Edessa, admitted likewise a good and an evil principle; denied the resurrection, and fell in with Apelles, Marcion, and the Docetæ, (see their respective articles) who contested the reality of Christ's incarnation and passion. These sectarists were the precursors of Manes, who ingrafted his own inventions upon their false principles. He curtailed and interpolated the New Testament, and with Marcion absolutely rejected the Old Testament as the work of evil powers; he also denied the inspiration, or at least the superior authority, of the Hebrew prophets; to whom he opposed ancient Chaldean Gentile philosophers; and he produced apocryphal books in support of his extravagant theorisms. He condemned the use of marriage as in itself sinful. The Manichees also reprobated war, but allowed necessary self-defence. Their elect were forbidden to build houses, to traffic, or to possess estates; and they boasted of great continency: but St Augustine who before his conversion was himself a Manichee, calls their chastity hypocrisy, and accuses them of abominable unnatural lusts, as do also the great St Leo and other fathers. Nor is it much to be wondered at, that, falling into habits of such crimes, they attempted to vindicate them by principle, though the general precepts of their sect condemned them. Of this we have seen an instance in our times in three eminent preachers of a new sect, notoriously convicted of justifying to their accomplices such excesses by principle, although by no means the result of any avowed doctrine of the sect. The Manichees held it lawful to dissemble or deny their religion, in order to avoid persecution; and from them the Priscillianists borrowed that pernicious maxim: *Jura, perjura, secretum prodere noli.*

St Augustine reproaches the Manichees also with idolatry—in the worship of the sun, moon and heavenly powers; for they ascribed to the intelligences which they supposed to preside over the heavenly bodies, certain perfections which belong exclusively to the Divine Being. (For a more circumstantial detail of the errors of this sect see the learned notes of Mr Butler, *Lives of the Primitive Fathers*, &c. vol. 8, p. 426, &c. *ibid.* p. 69, et seq.) Some Manichees maintained that trees and plants, as well as animals, had their feelings; and that they were capable of pleasure and of pain: so that, in their ideas, the plucking of any fruit,

reaping corn, lopping a branch off a tree, could not be considered, in any better light than as so many palliated murders; and, when bread was presented to them to eat, they withdrew a while; uttered the most dreadful imprecations against those that offered it, and then in a lamentable tone of voice addressed the bread to the following effect:—"It was not I that reaped you or sent you to the mill; nor had I any hand in kneading or in baking you; consequently, I am innocent of all the injuries which you have had to suffer. I heartily wish that those who have been the occasion of them may experience the like themselves." After this pious ejaculation, the religious Manichee without further scruple greedily devoured the poor loaf, and consoled himself with the cheering hope, that the person who had thus appeased his hunger would be severely punished for his charity. So strange a compound of sensuality, superstition and the basest ingratitude, is hard to conceive—to those that are not well acquainted with the mania of fanaticism. Others among the *elect* imagined, that in eating, they emancipated those small particles of the Divinity, attached in their fond notions to the digestible matter; and that these took their flight from their stomach to the heavenly mansions, and thus were reunited to their pure origin. With these men excessive gluttony was an act of religion, and a sublime work of piety. (See St Augustine de Moribus Manichæorum, de Hæres. op. imperfect. l. 6, c. 6, and St Epiphanius. Hæres. 6.)

Under pretence of apologizing for the fall of so great a genius as St Augustine into this monstrous heresy, the celebrated, though not less impious philosopher Bayle, instead of presenting us with a critical enquiry into the history of Manicheism—as the nature of his work required, gives only a crude and servile abstract of the general history of Manes from the uncertain acts of Archelaus, and takes every occasion, under the various articles of ancient and modern Manichees, Paulicians, &c. to adorn, improve and enforce, with all the subtilty of which he was master, the arguments of those heretics—against the mysteries of our faith concerning the origin of evil, &c. This he doubtless did with the same view of establishing his universal scepticism, and of shaking the foundation of all religion,—with which he unjustly insults the memory of David, and of so many other prophets and holy men, and attacks with a flow of false reasoning the mysteries of the Trinity, incarnation, &c. Nor is he less industrious under the article of this heresy, than under so many other heads, to collect a dunghill of filth and obscenities, in order to poison the *morals* of men, as well as their faith. The conference termed the acts of Archelaus, was not written by Archelaus, as many mistake: for Photius proves (Cod. 85) from Heraclian bishop of Chalcedon, who wrote twenty books against the Manichees, that Hegemonius was not the Greek translator—as St Jerom imagined—but the author of this history. Joseph Assemani has further

proved this point, (Bibl. Orient. T. 1, p. 555) and observes, that Hegemonius lived some time after Archelaus, and that he probably retrenched many things which had been spoken at the conference, and added others. This circumstance renders the credit of the acts under the name of Archelaus precarious and uncertain, as in some points they seem absolutely indefensible. Hence many of Bayle's remarks and arguments deduced from their supposed authenticity, are of no weight. The authority of the Greek fathers respecting Manes is also too much slighted by Beausobre: nor will this author easily persuade us, that the inquisitive St Augustine, who lived almost nine years a hearer of the Manichees, never understood their errors, and usually charges them with consequences of his own. The curious enquiries of this critic would have done him more honor, had his criticism been more modest and reserved;—had the fathers been treated by him with more decency, and if his warmth had not betrayed him into misrepresentations and slanders where he *might* and *ought* to have been better informed, especially l. 9, c. 4, 5, 9, T. 2. He wilfully mistakes the apostolical tradition appertaining to faith. (P. 2, T. 1.) This regards only revealed truths, &c. But as protestants seem ambitious of the honor of having the sectaries of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, many of whom were Manichees, for their predecessors, it was natural enough for Beausobre as such—to take part with the latter against the catholic church. They rejected the sacraments,—the veneration of the saints,—of the cross,—of images, &c. as cordially as protestants do. And are they not choice witnesses of the truth, tracing back their origin to an antiquity so remote as the third century, nay still farther—to the days of the apostles themselves,—by only adding to the train the ancient Gnostics? True; but the apostles condemned the Gnostics. Yes; and in their persons they proscribed by anticipation the Manichees—with all their multifarious offspring (protestants not excepted)—to the end of time. Are protestants then in earnest when they affect to derive their succession from the apostles through the medium of such glorious ancestry in doctrine? Are they willing to subscribe to the leading principles of these impious and ridiculous sects? If not, let them cease to challenge them for their religious progenitors.

Bayle pretends with the Manichees, that the origin of evil is inexplicable by the principles of christianity; and lays a mighty stress on this hypothesis,—that God in the creation of the universe could not have in view his own glory, and could be influenced purely by his goodness alone. Consequently, he must refer all to the well-being of his creatures, and must necessarily permit no evil to exist. But, unfortunately, the hypothesis on which the arguments of this sophistical writer wholly centre, is destitute of proof: it can never be demonstrated that the Divinity *could* have no other motive in creating the universe, but

the welfare of his creatures. There is nothing so impenetrable to human reason as the designs of the Divine Being :—*unsearchable are his ways*; and *who hath ever been his counsellor*? These designs of Divine Providence proceed from his free and absolute will: he does what he pleases, and forms such resolutions as he thinks fit, and with views most agreeable to his pleasure. These he hath not deemed expedient fully to reveal to man: and who shall have the presumption positively to define them? What penetration, for instance, could ever have discovered the intentions of the Almighty in the incarnation of the Son of God; had he not himself been pleased to communicate them to his creatures? But if the Supreme Being *might* have other designs in the creation of the world, besides the happiness of his creatures,—all Mr Bayle's objections instantly fall to the ground; and it is not inconsistent either with the wisdom or with the goodness of Almighty God, to have permitted evil. Let this suffice, as being a full and complete answer to the cavils of such infidel writers and irreligious sceptics.

MARCELLIANS. See the article PHOTINIANS.

MARCIONITES—one of the most ancient and most pernicious sects that attempted to subvert the unity of faith—so early as the second century. Marcion its author was a native of Pontus. After having embraced a state of continency, he violated his engagement to Almighty God; for which infidelity he was excommunicated by his diocesan bishop, said to have been his own father. Coming to Rome with the hopes of being there re-admitted to the communion of the church, he was required first to comply with the injunctions of his lawful superior. Upon which he commenced heresiarch, as Tertullian and Epiphanius inform us. He professed himself a Stoic philosopher, and joining with Cerdo who came out of Syria to Rome in the time of pope Hyginus, he maintained that there existed two Gods or First Principles; the one—the author of all good; the other,—of all evil, and also of the Jewish law, and the Old Testament which he pretended to be contrary to the New. He condemned marriage; refused baptism to all that did not profess virginity, although himself had notoriously prevaricated; and authorized the repetition of baptism, in order, he gave out, to purify the faithful more and more. He likewise held, that the body, which, according to him, was the production of the evil principle, would not rise again; that Jesus Christ had assumed human flesh in appearance only, and that his birth, his sufferings, his death and resurrection were merely apparent. According to St Ireneus, he taught moreover, that Jesus Christ in his descent into hell, had delivered thence the soul of Cain, those of the Sodomites, and of all sinners in general, because they had presented themselves before

him, and had not obeyed while upon earth—the laws of the Creator whom he supposed to be the evil Principle ; whereas, he had left there the souls of Abel, of Noe, of Abraham and the ancient just, because they had done precisely the reverse.

Many of the Marcionites, to testify their sovereign contempt of the flesh, offered themselves to martyrdom, and courted death : notwithstanding which, only three are known actually to have suffered death, in company with some christian martyrs. They fasted on the Saturday out of hatred to the Creator, who had commanded the Jews to observe it as a solemn feast. Many likewise, if Tertullian may be credited, practised judicial astrology ; some had recourse to magic, and implored the aid of the devil to arrest the progress of Theodoret, whose successful zeal effected the conversion of vast numbers of the Marcionites throughout his diocese.

The only work ascribed to Marcion was a treatise entitled *Antitheses* or *Contradictions*. In this work he set himself to prove—the opposition which he pretended to discover, between the ancient law and the gospel ; between the severity of the ordinances of Moses, and the mildness of those of Jesus Christ ; and he asserted, that the greatest part of the former were cruel, unjust and absurd. Hence he concluded, that the Creator of the universe, who speaks in the ancient testament, cannot be the same God who sent down Jesus Christ ; and, consequently, he did not believe the books of the Old Testament to have been divinely inspired. Of the four gospels, he received only that of St Luke, with the exception however, of the two first chapters which regard the birth of Christ. He admitted only ten of St Paul's epistles, and here too, he exploded whatever did not accord with his own ideas.

Several fathers of the second and third ages have employed their pens against Marcion ; St Justin, St Ireneus, St Theophilus of Antioch ; St Denis of Corinth, Tertullian, &c. Great part of these works are no longer extant. Those of Tertullian in five books—with his treatises *de Carne Christi*, *de Resurrectione Carnis* ; and the dialogues *de Rectâ in Deum Fide*—by a certain author named Adamantius who flourished after the council of Nice, though formerly by mistake ascribed to Origen, are the most complete of any that have survived the injuries of time. Tertullian in his first book against Marcion demonstrates, that an eternal and increated Principle must be sovereignly perfect, and, consequently, one ; that sovereign perfection is essential to a necessary Being ; and that there is no more reason for admitting two First Principles, than ten thousand ; since one all-perfect Being is essentially all-powerful and self-sufficient for all things. He shows, that Marcion's supposed *good* Principle, is by no means so in fact. This God according to his system has very ill provided for the salvation of men ; is not the author of any

one thing visible ; has suffered those *spirits* to which he did give being, to groan beneath the yoke of the Evil Principle, and permitted him to do what harm he pleased—without the smallest opposition. He must be therefore, either weak or stupid, as even Bayle allows: epithets—least of all becoming the majesty of God.

In the second book, Tertullian proves, that God as represented in the Old Testament, is truly and sovereignly *good* ; that his goodness is demonstrated by his works, by his providence, by his laws, his pardoning of sinners and his mercies in regard of them ; and even by his paternal chastisements and by the wisdom of the Mosaic dispensation which Marcion thinks fit to censure with blasphemous temerity. Hence he was equally unwarranted to say, that the ancient scriptures could not be the work of a good God ; and that the latter cannot be identified with the Creator of the visible world.

In the third book, Tertullian proceeds to shew, that our Blessed Saviour Jesus Christ constantly ascribed his mission to no other, than the great Creator of heaven and earth ; that this was also perpetually announced by the prophets ; and that he took flesh, and suffered, and died—in reality, and not in appearance only. The same he proves in his fourth book, shewing that Jesus Christ had punctually fulfilled—whatever the Creator had foretold of him by his prophets ; and exposes in the most glaring light the bold temerity of Marcion in rejecting the Old Testament, by which Christ himself had proved both his mission and his doctrine ;—and erasing from the New whatever did not tally with his own eccentric notions. In the fifth book, he continues to demonstrate from the epistles of St Paul, that the Redeemer is truly the Son and great ambassador of God the Father—the only Creator of all things both visible and invisible. In his treatise *De Carne Christi*, he had already proved the reality and the passibility of Jesus Christ ; and in that *De Resurrectione Carnis*, he evinces the future resurrection of the dead to be an essential dogma of the christian faith. Hence he makes it evident, that bodies as well as spirits are the work of an infinitely *good* God, and not of an *evil* principle. But why hath this *good* God permitted man to sin ? This is the grand objection of the Marcionites. He suffered it, replies Tertullian, because he had created man a free agent : now it was fitting that man should *exercise* his liberty : in this very instance he bears a resemblance with his Maker, and is capable of merit, and of recompence. Adamantius, St Basil and later fathers have answered much to the same effect ; adding that God permitted the fall of Adam, because he had decreed to repair with advantage its mischievous consequences—by a future redemption through our Saviour Christ. Nor is the goodness of God to be impeached, if after all, by the obstinate abuse of free-

will, man wilfully perverts the gifts of the Divine bounty to his final reprobation. God is infinitely just as well as good; and his goodness slighted—finally gives way to justice—without forfeiting its own existence, as a sister attribute of the Divinity.

Marcion had several disciples, who themselves in their turn, commenced authors of new sects; particularly Lucian and Apelles. And why should they not have the privilege equally with their master—to forge fresh systems at their discretion? Some admitted three Principles in lieu of two: one *Good*, a second *Just*, and a third *Evil*. (See the dialogues of Adamantius, sect. 1, note c. p. 804.) This is the peculiar prerogative of error. The Marcionites were eventually confounded with the Manichees. (See Tillemont, T. 2, p. 266, &c.)

MARKESIANS. SEC VALENTINUS.

MARONITES—christians who inhabit, chiefly, Mount Libanus, and other mountains of Syria. They date their christianity from the times of the apostles, and think they have invariably adhered to that profession ever since. The learned Maronite Faustus Nairon, professor of the Syriac tongue at Rome, attempted to demonstrate this opinion in a dissertation published in 1679, and in another work entitled *Euoplia fidei Catholicæ*, printed also at Rome in the year 1694. This people adhered to the council of Chalcedon, and were joined in communion with the Melchites or Loyalists, who maintained the authority of that synod against the Eutychians. Their present name they probably have derived from a certain bishop named Maro, who seems to have resided at the monastery of St Maro in the neighbourhood of Apamea, and who wrote a book entitled *A Treatise of Faith to the Libanists*, in which he combated the errors of the Nestorians and Eutychians. He continued to instruct and to govern them as their pastor, till his death, which happened in the year 707. Since that period, they had fallen into the heresy of the Monothelites, and some of them into Nestorianism; but were reclaimed from these errors in 1182, under the patriarch of Antioch Aimeric. Many, however, had embraced the Greek schism—till their final reunion with the catholic church in the pontificate of Gregory XIII. and Clement VIII. during the sixteenth century. They are now zealously attached to the church of Rome, and profess a strict obedience to the pope as their supreme pastor. Their seminary at Rome founded by Gregory XIII. under the direction of the society of Jesus, had before the suppression of that society produced several great men, who have exceedingly promoted true literature, especially the Oriental. We will instance only—Abraham Echellensis,—the three Assemani (Joseph, Stephen, and Evodius) whose curious researches are standing monuments of their erudition,

and entitle them to the gratitude of the learned, particularly the *Oriental Library* in 4 volumes folio, of one of the three last mentioned authors; in which he has presented us with an immense collection of Syriac writers;—and Lewis, known by his judicious writings on the ceremonies of the church. The patriarch of the Maronites styled—of Antioch, resides in the monastery of Canobine at the foot of Mount Libanus ten miles distant from Tripolis: he is confirmed by the pope, and has under him five metropolitans, namely, those of Tyre, Damascus, Tripolis, Aleppo, and Nicosia in Cyprus. (See *Le Quien Oriens Christianus*, T. 3, p. 46.)

Though many of the ancient Maronite books have been corrupted by the Syrian Jacobites, nevertheless they have preserved several unadulterated with any erroneous doctrines. They use the same liturgies with the Jacobites, because they have retained their original purity. (See *Le Brun, Explic. des Ceremon. de la Messe*, T. 4, p. 625, et suiv.) Their profession of faith is given in the third tome of *La Perpetuité de la Foi*, l. 8, c. 16. Their clergy are all allowed to marry before their ordination; but cannot marry a second time under pain of degradation. Their religious are poor, and have their dwelling for the most part, in some sequestered retreat upon the mountains; they work at country labor, till the ground, and never eat flesh meat. Their rule is that of the celebrated St Antony. The Maronite priests generally say mass all together, and not separately or in private, except on extraordinary emergencies; the rest assist the celebrant and receive the communion at his hands, as is done with us on the days of ordination. Their liturgy is in Syriac; although the epistle and gospel are read aloud in the vulgar Arabian. The people keep Lent, and on all fasting days take their meal only two or three hours before sun-set. See *Dandini*, translated into French by Mons. Simon.

A late French traveller who visited the mountains of Syria, informs us, that the Maronites study only the scripture and their catechism; but that they are an honest race of men, innocent in their morals and scrupulously attached to the Roman church; that they are laborious, and by their industry have fertilized the soil of the Syrian mountains, and have given them the appearance of a delightful garden. He adds, that the catholic religion has made great progress in Syria, at Damascus, and on the south-west side of the mountains, where heretofore sectarians and schismatics composed the bulk of the population. The missions in those quarters are entrusted to the Capucins, the Observantins of the Convent of Jerusalem, and the barefooted Carmelites of Tripolis and of Mount Carmel. This traveller does justice to their laborious zeal, and their proportionate success. See *Voyages de M. de Pages*, tome 1, p. 352, &c. M. Volney who passed eight months among the Maronites in 1784, gives

the same favorable testimony respecting their religion and morals. (*Voyage en Syrie et en Egypte*, t. 2, p. 8, &c.) And he calls the attention of his reader to the striking influence which religion possesses on the manners, the condition and the happiness of a people, in taking a comparative view of the Maronites and the Turks with reference to these important subjects.

We will conclude our notice of this people with observing, that as in spite of the errors into which at different epochs they had fallen, they nevertheless retained the same liturgies and the same forms of divine service, which they had used before the schism of the Jacobites in the fifth century, and still continue to use at this day, it is an undeniable proof of the religious creed then professed in the Oriental church. These books contain precisely the same doctrines and usages, which the church of Rome actually retains and recommends, and which our modern critics pretend to censure as novelties and innovations introduced into the Western church by the Roman pontiffs ! Such is the candor, good faith and veracity of their enemies.

MASBOTHEANS—the followers of Msabothheus, a disciple of Simon the Magician, and one of the seven heresiarchs who first attempted to corrupt the purity of the faith : this man denied Providence, and the resurrection of the dead. (*Theod. Hæret. Fab.* l. 1, c. 1. *Euseb. Hist. Eccles.* l. 4, c. 22.)

MASSILIANS, or MARSILLIANS. (See SEMI-PELAGIANS.)

MATERIALISTS—All those were by the ancient fathers called Materialists, who maintained that—of nothing nothing could be made ; that creation in the strict sense of the word was impossible ; and that God in the formation of the universe wrought upon an eternally pre-existent matter. This system of Materialism Tertullian solidly refuted in his treatise against Hermogenes. He demonstrates, that if matter is an eternal and necessary being, it cannot be subject to any imperfection, or liable to any change ; that God himself could not alter its state, or have any power over a being coëternal with himself. This argument Clarke has handled more in detail. Tertullian hence concluded, that matter had a beginning ; which could not be supposed without *creation*—in the proper meaning of the term. St Justin, in his Exhortation to the Gentiles (n. 23) : Origen, in his Commentary upon Genesis, and upon St John, (t. 1, n. 18) similarly prove, that if matter were eternal, God could not have possessed any influence or jurisdiction over it.

Hermogenes, not to attach any responsibility to the Divine Being in consequence of evil existing in the world, ascribed it—with the generality of the ancient philosophers—to the imperfection essential to matter. Tertullian replies, that in this

ease God ought not to have created the world at all, if he could not remedy the defects of matter ; and thus the supposed apology would be futile : that, moreover, it was an absurdity to ascribe to matter all the *evil*, and not equally the *good*, subsisting in the universe. He shews that Hermogenes contradicts himself—in supposing matter sometimes a good, at other times an evil ;—in making it infinite, and still subjecting it to the control of the Divinity. Matter, continues Tertullian, is contained within space ; consequently it is limited, and it is God alone that has prescribed its boundaries.

Modern Materialists—are those who hold no other substance but matter ; who maintain that spiritual substances are mere chimeras ; that in man the body is the sole principle of all his operations :—who deny the existence of a Supreme Being, or consider him as the soul of matter universally diffused through all bodies : hence, say they, proceed their motions and various alterations. As each of these mad systems presupposes the eternity and self-existence of matter, they are already refuted by the triumphant arguments of the holy fathers against the ancient Materialists. To philosophers we may leave the province of demonstrating matter to be essentially incapable of a spiritual operation, such for instance as is—thought : this is an operation simple and indivisible ; it cannot have for its subject or its principle a divisible substance like matter. Though we should even admit an indivisible atom of matter, no other essential quality could possibly be ascribed to it, but inertness or the incapacity of producing any active operation. Besides, Materialists will easily grant that matter is rendered capable of thought only by organisation : this requires the reunion and arrangement of different parts of matter ; which cannot take place without an efficient cause distinct from matter itself.

Materialists, it is worthy of remark, produce no direct proof whatever of their system ; they only start objections against the hypothesis of spirituality. It is difficult, say they, to conceive the nature of a spiritual being, its operations, its confinement within a body to which it gives motion. But is it easier to comprehend matter to be eternal, necessary, increated, and yet finite and with attributes neither necessary nor eternal, but liable to change ? Can we conceive a being purely passive, indifferent alike to motion or repose,—to be notwithstanding, itself the very principle of motion ;—a being composed of parts,—divisible and still the subject of modifications indivisible ? These are not merely inconceivable mysteries ; they are palpable contradictions. Certainly, it is less absurd to admit incomprehensible mysteries, than gross inconsistencies ; nay, it is the extreme of folly to attempt to stifle the interior conviction which informs us—that we are something more than mere modifications of crude matter.

MAXIMIANISTS—a sect of Donatists. See that article.

MELCHISEDECIANS—sectaries who professed the most extravagant veneration for Melchisedec. Of these, the most ancient were a branch of Theodotians in the third century, who maintained that Melchisedec was not a mortal man, but the power of God; and that he was superior even to Jesus Christ, and Mediator between God and the angels, whereas Jesus Christ, they said, was Mediator between God and man only. (See THEODOTIANS.) Towards the close of the third age, this heresy was renewed in Egypt by a certain Hierax, who pretended that Melchisedec was the Holy Ghost. Some ancients, upon we know not what grounds, accuse Origen of this error; no traces of it are discoverable in his writings which have come down to us. Another sect of Melchisedecians is spoken of by ecclesiastical authors more modern than the former. They seem to have been a branch of the Manichees, and, strictly speaking, neither Jews, nor christians, nor pagans. These were called *Attingani*, because they made a scruple of *touching* any person, for fear of contamination. When any thing was presented to them, they would not take it before it was laid upon the ground; and they observed the same ceremony in presenting things to others. These enthusiasts had a similar outrageous veneration for Melchisedec with the former, and inhabited the borders of Phrygia. We may rank those too, on the list of Melchisedecians, who have asserted that Melchisedec was no other than the Son of God who appeared to Abraham, according to them, under a human form. This opinion from time to time has had its votaries. All of them misguided, principally by certain figurative expressions of St Paul, comparing the Jewish priesthood with that of the new law according to the order of Melchisedec; who was a king in Palestine, and also a priest of the most high God, and offered sacrifice in bread and wine.

In all the above pretenders to scriptural doctrine, as we often have occasion to remark, we behold a striking instance of the fallacy of private interpretation, and of the enormous abuse of the word of God, to which those are liable, that refuse submission to the authority of the catholic church. Prejudice itself must see the justice of this remark.

MELCHITES—a word derived from the Syriac, and signifying *Royalists* or *Imperialists*. This nickname, the Eutychians, condemned by the council of Chalcedon, thought fit to give to the orthodox who adhered to the decisions of the council, and and to the edict of the emperor Marcion enjoining their execution. For the same reason they were also called Chalcedonians. The epithet of *Melchite* is common to all the christians in the East, except the Jacobites and Nestorians. It attaches not only

to the Greek catholics who live in communion with the church of Rome, and to the Syrian Maronites, subject in like manner to the Roman see ; but also to the Greek schismatics of the patriarchates of Antioch, Jerusalem and Alexandria, who have not adopted the errors either of the Eutychians, or Nestorians. The Greek patriarchs of those three sees are subject, in many instances, to the patriarch of Constantinople ; conform to the rites of the latter church, and use only the liturgies of St Basil and St Chrysostom, in common with the church of Constantinople.

MELECIANS—those who schismatically took part with Melecius bishop of Lycopolis. This man was deposed in a synod by his metropolitan St Peter of Alexandria, for having sacrificed to idols during the persecution of Dioclesian. He obstinately refused submission, and formed a schism which continued near one hundred and fifty years. As neither himself nor his adherents were accused of any error against faith, the prelates assembled at Nice in the year 325 invited them to return to the communion of the church, and agreed to admit them without insisting upon a previous course of penitence. Many, together with Melecius himself, professed their submission to Alexander the then patriarch of Alexandria ; although, it would seem, their reconciliation was not sincere, and Melecius is said quickly to have resumed his former refractory disposition, and to have died in his schism. When St Athanasius was placed in the patriarchal chair, the Meleciens hitherto the declared enemies of Arius, entered into a league with the Arian faction to persecute and slander this most zealous defender of the Nicene faith. Ashamed however, of the excesses into which their groundless hatred had betrayed them, they afterwards desired a reunion ; and Arsenius their leader wrote to him upon the subject in terms of respect, and ever after remained firm in his attachment. Some of the party, notwithstanding, continued obstinate ; as appears from the circumstance of their schism still subsisting in the days of Theodoret, who charges them with a variety of superstitious and ridiculous observances.

MENANDRIANS—were one of the most ancient sects among the Gnostics. Menander their author was a disciple of Simon the magician ; was a great proficient in the black art, and after the death of his master commenced independent sectarist. Simon had most blasphemously maintained himself to be the great energy of God, and the omnipotent. Menander contented himself with the title of Messiah. He pretended, that the majesty of the Supreme Being was unknown to the world—any farther than as the source of all existence, and the virtue by which all things have their being. A multitude of genii, according to Menander, had proceeded from him, and formed the universe together with

the human kind. These creating angels—through impotence or malice, confined the human soul in bodies so organised, as to subject it to a continual alternative of good and evil; all evil being the effect of the fragility of those organs, and terminating only with the greatest of evils, which was death. Touched with the miseries of wretched mortals, certain spiritual intelligences, of a nature more benign, had disseminated upon earth unfailing antidotes against these miseries. Menander was divinely commissioned to reveal these precious antidotes to men, and to teach them how to triumph over the creating angels. The mystery consisted in the art of rendering the organs of the human body unsusceptible of change. Menander, to effect this, ordered his disciples a kind of magic bath which they termed the *true resurrection*, because it ensured to them constant health of body, and vigor unimpaired by age.

There were Menandrians at Antioch when St Justin wrote, that firmly believed themselves immortal. (See Iræñ. l. 2, c. 21. Tert. de Præscript. c. 5. Euseb. l. 3, c. 26. Justin. Apol. 2. Aug. de Hær. c. 2.) In fact, almost every age, strange as it may appear, under various denominations has had its Menandrians, who have pretended to an exemption from mortality—sometimes by their system of religion—sometimes by the boasted mysteries of alchymy or the chimeras of the cabalistic art. At the commencement of the eighteenth century one of our countrymen asserted that—if men died, this was merely the effect of custom; that they might, if they pleased, live here below without the fear of ever dying, and be translated into heaven, as formerly were Enoch and Eliás, without any previous dissolution. “Man,” says M. Asgil, “was originally created in a state of immortality. God subjected him to the penalty of death—only in consequence of his sin: Jesus Christ appeared amongst us in order to repair the damage caused in the world by sin, and to procure for mankind the immortality of the spirit, and that of the body also. If then christians are liable to death, it is to be ascribed to their want of faith!!” Pity his own was not strong enough to have rescued himself at least, from the all-grasping fangs of this unrelenting tyrant.

MENNONITES—See ANABAPTISTS.

MESSALIANS, or **EUCHITES**, that is, the Prayers (for the word *Messal* in Syriac and *Euchites* in Greek, have the same import)—were a fanatical sect in Mesopotamia, who owed their origin to their misinterpretation of scripture. The scripture teaches, that in order to be perfect, it is advisable for persons to sell what they possess, and give to the poor;—to renounce all things, &c. A certain devotee named Sabas, ardently aspiring to evangelical perfection, and taking these and other similar pas-

sages of the gospel in their strictest literal sense, with more zeal than christian discretion, made himself an eunuch ; disposed of his possessions in favour of the poor ; and then refused to labor for a perishable subsistence. From other texts of scripture taken also in their literal acceptation, he concluded—that we were environed with troops of evil spirits, and that all our temptations originated with them : he believed that at the birth of each individual—a demon seized him, and caused him to commit whatever sinful actions he might afterwards through life be subject to. Holy scripture represents the devil *as a roaring lion, famishing with hunger, who continually goes about seeking whom he may devour*. Sabas imagined himself incessantly surrounded by legions of his wicked angels, and was observed in the midst of his devotions—in violent agitation—starting up and jumping as high as he was able, and—as he thought—over armies of these hellish fiends. He was often seen, as if in actual conflict, to move his arms like a person drawing the bow ; and he fancied he was discharging a flight of arrows at his spiritual enemies. His visionary dreams he took for revelations, and presently commenced prophet. The attention of the multitude was attracted ; they caught his spirit ; and a crowd of men and women attended him ;—selling their possessions,—leading a life of idleness, and without the least regard to common decency, sleeping promiscuously in the streets. These maniacs, like their fanatic author, believed the atmosphere to be brim-ful of devils, and that they inhaled them together with the vital air. In consequence of this idea, they were unceasingly in the act of spitting, or employed in blowing their noses. Sometimes they fell into a kind of ecstasy, acted the prophet, and fondly thought they beheld the Trinity. “ In such instances much is to be ascribed to a heated imagination ; though it seems not to be doubted,” says Mr Alban Butler, in his *Life of St Amphilochius*, “ but by the Divine permission they sometimes suffered extraordinary impulses and illusions from the devil ; in which it is easy to discover from the imperfect relations which we have of the Messalians, an affinity with the modern fanatics of various sects ; such, for instance, as those of the Cevennes among the Huguenots, the Convulsionarians among the Jansenists at Paris, and several of our English enthusiasts.”

The Messalians did not break off communion with the catholics. These they regarded as a poor ignorant and stupid race of men, who in their simplicity had recourse to the sacraments to strengthen them against the assaults of Satan ; whereas themselves more wisely placed their confidence in uninterrupted prayer. Whence, as observed above, they have derived their name. Much of their time they spent in singing spiritual canticles, or in reciting almost without intermission the Our Father, &c. They had made some proselytes at Edessa, when Flavian

bishop of Antioch expelled them from that city: whence they retreated, first into Pamphylia, and being there condemned by a council, they passed into Armenia, and succeeded in introducing their errors into several monasteries in those parts. Letorius bishop of Melitene inhumanly caused these monasteries to be burnt; in which numbers of the poor deluded people perished. Those among them that survived, retired for protection to another Armenian prelate; who had compassion on them, and treated them with mildness and truly christian charity. On these Messalians, see the author of *Les Egaremens de l'Esprit Humain*. St Epiphanius speaks of another more ancient sect of Messalians, who admitted a plurality of gods, but adored only one whom they called the Omnipotent, or the Most High. Tillemont with much probability supposes them to have been the same with the Hypsistarians. (See the article.) These Messalians, says Epiphanius, have erected in divers places oratories illuminated with lamps and flambeaux, not unlike our churches; wherein they assemble to pray and chaunt hymns in honor of the Divine Being.

In the tenth age also, there appeared a new sect of Messalians, or, more properly, a species of Manichees: they admitted two Gods born of a pre-existing Divinity; the younger reigned in heaven, the elder upon earth. Him they called Satan; and they imagined that the two brother gods waged a mutual unceasing war; but that at length they would be reconciled. (Le Clerc, *Biblioth. univ.* t. 15, p. 119.) Lastly, the twelfth century likewise had its Messalians, supposed to have been the precursors of the Bogomilians. See their article. It is difficult, however, to trace with accuracy in what these various sects agreed, or what principles were peculiar to each apart. But most of them are proved to have been of abandoned morals—by contemporary historians of unimpeached veracity; although Mosheim would willingly excuse them, because they generally exclaimed aloud against the supposed or real abuses,—the superstitions, and the vices of the clergy; favorite topics of those that wish, at all events, to quarrel with the catholic church. Perhaps the reformation may have occasion for these madmen also, to complete its motley genealogy!

On the Messalians or Massalians, see St Epiph. (*hær.* 80) St Jerom. *Proem. in dial. adv. Pelag. &c.* also Jos. Assemani, *Bibl. Orient.* vol. 1, p. 128, vol. 4. 170, and Euthymii Zigabeni *Panoplia* tit. 26, et alibi, with Hermenopilus *de sectis*, p. 570.

METAMORPHOSISTS, or TRANSFORMERS—were a sect of the twelfth age, who pretended that the body of Jesus Christ, at the moment of his ascension, had been transformed into the Divinity. Some Lutheran Ubiquitarians have been charged with renewing this error.

METANGISMONITES—of whom St Augustine makes mention *Hær.* 57—derive their name from the Greek terms *Μετα* and *Ἀγγιον*, importing—in a vessel: they said, that the Word was in his Father, just as one vessel is contained within another. This sect appears to have been of Arian extraction.

METHODISTS—a name given 1st, by protestants to their adversaries the French controversialists; of whom Mosheim in his ecclesiastical history says:—These Methodists may be distributed into two classes. Those of the first class pretended to dictate to protestants certain unreasonable norms, to which they were inviolably to adhere in religious disputation. Of this number was the ex-Jesuit Veron, curate of Charenton, who required of his adversaries, that they should prove every article of their creed by clear and formal texts of Holy Scripture; and would not allow them the privilege of reasoning at all, or of tracing any consequence whatever, or deducing any argument from the apparent intimation of the text. He was followed by Berthold Nihusius a renegado from protestantism; by the two Wallembourgs and others, who found it easier to retain what they possessed, than to evince the justice of their title. The burden of proof they abandoned to their adversaries, and reserved to themselves only the more easy task of eluding the force of the soundest logical conclusions. Cardinal Richelieu, and a crowd of catholic polemics, wished to set aside the complaints and the reproaches of the reformed, and to content themselves with proving the divine authority of the church—by reasons the most decisive and unequivocal.

Those of the second class, continues Mosheim, to decide the contest with their adversaries in the most summary way, adopted a sort of general arguments, which they called warrantable prejudices, (See Nicole's *Prejugés Legitimes contre les Calvinistes*) any one of which—developed and displayed to advantage—was alone sufficient, in the opinion of some controvertists after him, to demonstrate the imposture or the nullity of the reform. Some of these Methodists have opposed to it their pretended right of prescription; others the vices and want of mission in the reformers; a third set have attempted only to prove, that this religious revolution was in fact a schism, and therefore of itself highly criminal.

Bossuet, agreeably to the remark of this learned Lutheran author, undertook to demonstrate the falsehood of the religion established by Luther, by exposing the perpetual changeableness of opinion among its doctors; and the multitude of variations so discernible in its doctrines; while he proved the authority and the divine origin of the Roman catholic persuasion, from the constancy with which its religious dogmas have been handed down to us unadulterated, through each revolving age. All these different

methods of combating the reformation, in Mosheim's ideas, have embarrassed protestants, more than they have advanced the cause of catholicity. It is true, he admits, many princes and some enlightened scholars, have suffered themselves to be seduced by these captious arguments, and have returned to the communion of that church, from which their fathers had seceded: but their example has not been copied by any single nation, nor even by one solitary canton. After enumerating the most illustrious proselytes, as well princes as learned individuals, he tells us, that the number is very inconsiderable—of those who, from truly conscientious motives, have readopted the ancient faith.

The lynx-eyed sagacity of Mr Mosheim, doubtless, must have been derived immediately from above, thus to penetrate the secrets of hearts! While our methodistic controversialists demonstrate, that the reformers in their schism were influenced by a spirit of libertinism and independence, and the ambition of becoming leaders of a sect, protestants cry out calumny, and enquire—by what right their adversaries pretend to sound the hearts and the intentions of their fellow men, and to ascribe to a principle of depravity in them, what might be the innocent result of misconception or a mere defect of judgment. But behold! these very delicate and tender casuists are the first to violate their own, uncommonly charitable, maxim—in the case of all those who have had the courage and the virtue to renounce the schism and erroneous principles of their deluded ancestors. How heavily would Mr Mosheim have complained, had any one politely told him, that his only motive for choosing to live and die a Lutheran was—his occupying the most dignified situation in a university, or enjoying the douceurs of a prime good *living*? Nor is it a matter of surprise, that the vulgar sort among the Lutherans should continue obstinately stedfast in the errors of their early youth, notwithstanding the example of many princes and the most enlightened personages of their communion—quitting their former prejudices, and eagerly embracing the catholic religion. The fact is:—they are ignorant; and are determined to remain so;—they are not in the habit of reading catholic books, and are moreover diverted from it by their ministers; while the eventual conversion of those who have well examined both sides of the question, appears to us, we must own, a reasonable presumption in favour of catholicity, and a well-grounded argument against protestantism.

Our catholic Methodists are equally warranted—in calling upon protestants to prove each article of their doctrine—by the clear and formal testimony of holy scripture. This is their only rule of faith, and they avowedly maintain, that every question should be decided, and all disputes be terminated by its sole authority and guidance. They have themselves prescribed this law to catholics; and these have met them on their own ground. If

then they feel the restraint somewhat troublesome, whom have they to blame but themselves? They are the aggressors, and have entered a protest against the catholic church and its possession of full fifteen hundred years; it is their's to prove—from holy scripture—that this possession is founded in injustice and a lawless usurpation. This is a task which none have ever yet attempted, or we apprehend, ever will attempt—with tolerable success, or even—with the slightest plausibility of reason. Mr Mosheim, therefore, is in the right to deprecate the challenge of our Methodist divines.

With equal justice does this cherished critic except against the method of the Cardinal Richlieu, who insisted that, as protestants alleged for the motive of their schism—that the Roman was no longer the true church of Jesus Christ, by proving the reverse, we subvert the very ground-work of the reformation. On this head, as in all other points, our adversaries have made but a very feeble defence; they have shifted their ground, and sometimes have asserted the church to be *invisible*, sometimes to be a compound of all the various sects of christians—excommunicating and disclaiming all connection with each other! The great Bossuet, and a whole legion of catholic theologists, have triumphantly demonstrated the absurdity of both these airy systems; nor have protestants been able to support them with any specious argument. They only have maintained—without the semblance of a proof—that the catholic church had set them the example in varying its faith. They have said:—we find no monuments in the three first ages—of such and such false doctrines since adopted by the church of Rome; consequently, say they, they were not then believed, and of course this church must have varied its religious creed. These negative arguments are illusive. The church of the fourth age solemnly professes to believe no articles, but such as were believed and generally professed in the preceding age, and delivered by the apostles; therefore the existing monuments of the fourth age are a sufficient proof, that the articles in question had been already taught and believed before that era. What Mosheim objects from the avowal of even French divines with relation to the encroachments of certain popes, is alike nugatory and irrelevant. French divines admit—that many popes had availed themselves of circumstances to extend their jurisdiction; to circumscribe that of bishops; to dispose of church benefices, &c.; and that they had thus introduced changes into the ancient *discipline*. But discipline and doctrine, unfortunately, are quite different things. Bossuet has demonstrated—that protestants have varied in their *articles of faith*: Mosheim merely proves—what no body ever thought of contesting with him—a variation of *discipline*; and what is this but imposition and chicanery? Besides, it is the opinion of French theologians, that the Roman pontiff can-

not by himself definitively pronounce upon articles of faith, and that his decision is not infallible, unless confirmed by the general acquiescence of the whole church. How then could they, with any consistency, accuse the popes of *altering* the faith of the catholic church? But, in vain do we look for candor or sincerity in this critic and champion of the reformation, or in a host of controversial writers in defence of the same untenable and unhallowed cause.

Nor is it true, that catholic polemics confine themselves to invalidate the proofs of their antagonists in support of their religious system—without attempting to substantiate their own. Let but any one peruse Veron's *Profession of Catholic Faith*; he will find that he establishes each article upon the formal testimony of the written word. The Wallembourgs have done the same: but they have not stopt here. They have moreover demonstrated, that the catholic church, in proving her dogmas of faith and refuting all erroneous doctrines, has uniformly—with the fathers in every age—adopted precisely the same method; whereas that of the protestants is essentially defective, and calculated to justify indiscriminately—all heresies whatever:—that the distinction of fundamental and non-fundamental articles, is delusory and abusive; that their bible is adulterated both by arbitrary expositions, and wilful mistranslations, as they shew at large by comparing them with other versions of their own; and that, not satisfied with this their unwarrantable temerity, they have rejected every book of Holy Scripture which they know not how to reconcile with their novel doctrines. After this, they object to the reformers their want of a lawful mission, the novelty of their religious code, and the guilt of schism. Whether in this their *method* there be any thing like unfair dealing, we leave it to the good sense of our readers to determine. What Mosheim complains of with so little reason in his *Catholic Methodists*, English protestant writers, almost universally, practise as their exclusive privilege—against the church of Rome.

METHODISTS (protestant)—seemingly an increasing sect, claim an antiquity of somewhat more than eighty years. John Wesley, their principal founder, was son to a clergyman of the church of England, and received his education at Oxford. Upon his return he was presented to one of his father's livings. During his absence from the university, his brother Charles, a Mr Morgan, and one or two other companions, formed a little society, with a design, it would seem, of leading a devout life. This took place in 1729. Not long after John Wesley returned, and put himself at the head of this new society. Some few others joined, and among the rest, in 1735, George Whitfield. They visited the sick and prisoners, and gave abundant alms. Living according to a rule, they were denominated Methodists; and were

sometimes called—Sacramentarians, from their frequently receiving the sacrament; and, from their apparent holiness—the Holy Club. In Ireland they still retain the nick-name of *Swaddlers*, given them, it is said, in consequence of a sermon of one of their first lay preachers there, who had taken for his text in Ezech—*Thou wert not swaddled at all*. In 1735, John Wesley visited Georgia, in America, in order to preach his new gospel to the Indians; but had not the good fortune to make any converts. After spending there to little purpose nearly two years, *shaking off the dust from his feet*, he returned to England, where he fell in with one Peter Bohler, a Moravian brother, whose orthodoxy Wesley deemed more pure than his own; and accordingly he became himself a member of the brotherhood.

Meanwhile Whitfield also, took a trip to America—with similar religious intentions, and with the like success. Instead of making proselytes, he too was perverted, and exchanged his former creed for that of Calvinism, to which he adhered for the remainder of his life. This man became the founder of the second branch of Methodism.

In lieu, however, of converting infidels during his residence in Georgia, John Wesley had succeeded in establishing there another small society—after the model of that of Oxford, previously to his own conversion by Bohler the Moravian. But the Methodist society, properly speaking, did not begin till May, 1738—in London. Wesley says in his first journal, that he had not yet attained to justifying faith: he had, he says, the *faith of a slave, not that of a child*. But on the twenty-fourth of May the same year, being present at a Lutheran meeting, he tells us, he felt his heart to *grow warm*, and imagined he received a supernatural assurance—that his sins were forgiven. Whether he on this occasion became a Lutheran, is not mentioned: if he did, he did not long continue so. Of his various peregrinations, or even hardships suffered in the cause of Methodism, as I cannot think well of his doctrine, I will say nothing; observing only, that at a very advanced age he went to receive the reward of his labors, in the close of the eighteenth century.

According to the Wesleyan system of theology, orthodoxy or correctness in point of doctrine is no *essential* part of religion, *if it be any part at all!* Religion consists, he says,—in holiness of disposition,—in the love of God and our fellow-creatures;—no doctrine but this, in Wesley's ideas, is necessary to salvation! Can then that gospel love of God which is the fulfilment of the law, exist without its essential conditions? Heathens to whom the gospel hath not been preached, according to *him*, are *justified* by an interior light, without even knowing Christ. But how does this accord with those words of our Blessed Saviour—*this is eternal life, that they know Thee, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent?* Wesley tells us, that those who have

heard the gospel, are justified by *faith alone*—in formal contradiction to St James, who says—*Faith without works, is dead*. Repentance, Wesley insists, is merely a conviction of sin: so that provided I am convinced I have done wrong, it matters little, it would seem, whether I be resolved to repeat the crime or not! The fruits of repentance may, he says, precede justification, or they may not; but they are not necessary: the only condition is faith, or a sure trust and confidence, that Christ died for *me*; yea even, quoth he, for *me*;—that he hath taken away *my* sins,—even *mine*. Surely this is a doctrine very commodious, and highly agreeable to flesh and blood, however irreconcilable with the gospel of Jesus Christ. The moment a sinner believes this, continues our new evangelist, he is justified; and immediately the spirit (of *delusion*, we presume, certainly not the spirit of *truth*) witnesses to his spirit, that he is a child of God. This is the beginning of the new birth; for Wesley acknowledges none in baptism, notwithstanding our Blessed Redeemer's expressly teaching the contrary, in the following words—*Unless a person be born again of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God*. (Jo. iii. 5.) Baptism, he proceeds, is an empty sign of future blessings; yet Methodists believe that all children, baptised or unbaptised, are saved: nay, Mr Fletcher, a celebrated Methodistic writer, maintains, that the guilt of original sin was actually taken from all men by Christ's redemption, and is found in none—*evidently* in opposition to the text just quoted. The fruits of faith, resumes Mr Wesley, are—joy, peace and love, that is felt by every righteous man;—a notion not warranted by scripture, which says—*No man knoweth whether he be worthy of love or hatred*. (Eccles. c. ix. 1.) The *being* of original sin termed by Methodists *inbred* sin, remains; but is not *imputed*. Perhaps it had escaped Mr Wesley's recollection—that all sin whatever, in a greater or a less degree, defiles the soul; and that nothing *defiled* can enter into heaven. (Rev. xxi.) Sanctification, re-continues our great divine, is a distinct work. Are we then to believe that christian justification may subsist without holiness? Sanctification is instantaneous, rejoins Mr Wesley, as well as justification; while authors as spiritual as this gentleman, and much more theologically accurate, affirm it to be, in general, attained but *gradually*. Works, says he, are no more the conditions of the one than of the other; for this plain reason, we presume, that they are the conditions equally—of *both*. By *faith alone*, Mr Wesley will have it, a man is sanctified; although St Paul assures us, that faith strong enough to remove mountains, will profit nothing without charity. Methodists, however, exhort their hearers to good works *after* justification; for *before*, they tell us, they are sinful, and that even *duties* in an unjustified person—are *sins*. Does then the prophet Daniel

advise the infidel king Nebuchodonosor—to redeem his sins by adding to their number? Sanctification is the extirpation of inbred sin, or concupiscence, says Mr Wesley; but what says St Paul?—*I see another law in my members fighting against the law of my mind*, (Rom. vii.) While Mr Wesley declares, that no concupiscence remains; and that the evil nature is gone:—that a sanctified person may indeed be tempted *from abroad*, but not *from within*; *It is sin which dwelleth in me, that doeth it*, repeats the same apostle, *ibid.* Which of the two must a christian believe?

In general, Methodists admit, that a person may fall from a state of justification, and even of sanctification; although Wesley sometimes speaks of a state from which one cannot fall:—to such St Paul addresses himself to little purpose, when he says—*If any one thinketh himself to stand, let him take heed lest he fall.* By reading Lord King's Account of the Primitive Church, Mr Wesley adopted the opinion, that bishops and presbyters are the same order. (Against this erroneous doctrine see the article Aërius.) When old, he ordained Dr Coke bishop, and two of his lay-preachers presbyters. Coke sailed immediately for America, where, he also, took upon himself to consecrate one of his fellows bishop; and thus was founded, in 1784, the Methodist pretended episcopal church of America. A new prayer-book was published for the use of that church, and of the Methodists in general, under the title—Sunday Service of the Methodist; from which the catechism, the Athanasian and Nicene creeds, the absolution in the morning and afternoon service, and for the visitation of the sick, are retrenched, and the thirty-nine articles reduced to twenty-five—with various other material alterations of the common Book of Prayer; and yet Methodists affect to make a part of the church of England, whose discipline and doctrines they so unequivocally discard!

The supremacy of the sect is lodged in the *conference*, or the collective body of the travelling preachers. They have superintendants, local preachers, exhorters and band-leaders. The *classes* are small companies of Methodists who meet weekly under their leader; whose office it is to enquire—*how their souls prosper?*—To advise, reprove, comfort or exhort, as may be needful: to receive their offerings for the relief of the poor; and to pay to the stewards of the society what is thus collected, and to inform the minister if any should be sick, or incorrigible in their disorders.

The *bands* are smaller companies of married or unmarried persons of each sex, apart; in order to confess to each other their sins—of thought, word or deed,—together with their respective temptations, and behaviour under them; the leader of the band first setting the example, and then enquiring of each their particular failings, &c.

Love feasts are quarterly meetings, where, in token of brotherly love, each one receives a small bit of cake, and generally before they are dismissed *that*, say they, *which endureth unto everlasting life*.

The *Conference* is annually convened in order to consult about the affairs of the societies.

The office of a *Helper* is to preach morning and evening; to meet the Society and Bands weekly, and to see the Leaders also weekly.

The *Assistant* was the chief preacher in a circuit who immediately *assisted* Mr Wesley in the regulation of the societies. See Wesley's Life by Messrs Coke and Moore.

The two grand divisions consist of the Election or Calvinistic Methodists in Whitfield's Connexion, and the Wesleyan or Arminian Methodists. The latter hold that Christ died for *all*, and that justification and sanctification are an interior work of the Spirit, as observed above: the former maintain *imputed* righteousness; that Christ died only for the elect;—and are Predestinarians. These two have branched into many other less considerable sects. For it often happens that a preacher turns independent, when he is popular enough to form a party and shake off the yoke of the Conference. The most noted of these parties is that of the Kilhamites, whose author Mr Kilham contended, that a proportionable number of lay-members and local preachers should be admitted to sit in the Conference with the travelling preachers; and that an account should be given to the Methodist society at large—of the sums lodged in their hands: this being refused, a division took place, and Kilham was excommunicated. For a more minute detail of Methodism, its various rules and discipline, Wesley's Life by Messrs Coke and Moore, Nightingale's Portraiture of the Methodists, the Rev. Nicholas Gilbert's tracts, together with Mr Slack's answers, &c. may be consulted. The latter gentleman by the bye, in his attempts at a reply to Mr Gilbert, has only exposed, still more apparently, to the intelligent reader, the weakness of the cause which he undertakes to advocate.

In the Methodist community, it will not be denied, that great numbers of well meaning persons are to be found, who are influenced by the best of motives: but their *principles* are wrong; they rest not on a sound *foundation*; they have abandoned the only criterion of truth. That authority which Christ hath most emphatically recommended, and the common creed of christians acknowledges, they have discarded as a treacherous rule: they refuse to hear that church which our blessed Saviour hath commanded all to hear—under pain of being looked upon *as the heathen man or the publican*;—that church which, as St Paul assures us, is the *very pillar and firm support of the truth*. Their prophets were self-commissioned; they undertook to preach the

faith to others, before they knew themselves what true faith was; before they so much as believed in Jesus Christ. (See Wesley's Journ. 1.) Of such, Almighty God himself heretofore complained:—*They have prophesied falsely to you in my name, and I have not sent them, saith the Lord.* (Jerem. xxix. 9.)

If it be objected, that much good has resulted from Mr Wesley's preaching; that great disorders have been reformed, and the morals of the people altered for the better;—all this we are willing to allow, and feel no reluctance in conceding to Mr Wesley the merit of so considerable a benefaction to society; nay, we will even give him credit in most instances, for the purity of his intentions. All this too, we are not less disposed to admit in favor of some other fellow sectarists; George Fox, for instance, and William Penn;—and to extend it even to the whole body of the people called Quakers. But will this suffice to verify their doctrine; to make that orthodox which even Mr Wesley would allow to be unscriptural and fundamentally erroneous? If it be said:—Mr Wesley was a learned, and a good man:—so were thousands of those whose opinions in religious matters he despised;—the Cyprians, the Cyrils, the Ambroses, the Basils, the Chrysostoms, the Jeroms, the Augustines, the Gregories, and an innumerable phalanx of enlightened and most holy personages who have done honor to religion, and to human nature itself, in each succeeding age. Were these all wrong; and the founder of the Methodist persuasion,—a society, of but yesterday, the first discoverer of pure religion and the genuine truth? The supposition would imply blasphemy, and give the lie to the promises of Christ, whose sacred words *shall not pass away*, though *heaven and earth*, he says, *shall pass away.* (Mat. xxiv.)

Before we dismiss this article, we are free to acknowledge ourselves at a loss to know—what Mr Wesley means by *faith alone*. Does he mean to exclude the divine virtues of Hope and Charity? The former he seems absolutely to discard, as in his system all doubt and fear must be done away; and perfect security of our acceptance with God, and eternal salvation substituted in its place. Why then, we must ask again, does the great apostle of the Gentiles declare in his first epistle to the Corinthians, c. 13, that if he should have *all* faith even so as to remove mountains, and give his substance to the poor and his body to the flames, and have not charity;—it would avail him nothing? Right; says Mr Wesley: but justifying faith produces charity. Rather does not charity produce justifying faith? Independently of charity, St Paul assures us, faith cannot justify. Consequently—not faith alone, but charity with the other two divine virtues conjointly; the greater of the three as we are informed by the same apostle (*ibid*) being charity. Does Mr Wesley mean all this? If not; his doctrine is evidently unscriptural: if he does;

why does he not speak intelligibly? Had he done so, neither Calvinism nor Antinomianism would have classed him among its patrons.

MILLENARIANS—those who in the second and third ages maintained, that at the end of the world Jesus Christ would descend upon earth to establish a temporal kingdom, in which the faithful should enjoy a temporary felicity—during the term of one thousand years before the last general judgment, and still more perfect bliss in heaven: the Greeks denominated these christians *Chiliasts*; an epithet synonymous with that of Millenarians. This opinion was grounded upon that passage in the twentieth chapter of the Apocalypse, where it is said, that the martyrs shall reign with Jesus Christ *a thousand years*. Some primitive fathers, among whom were Papias, bishop of Hierapolis and a disciple of St John the Evangelist, and after him—St Justin, St Ireneus, Lactantius, Tertullian, &c. understood this mysterious prophecy in the literal sense of the words. But they did not imagine with Cerinthus and his sectarians, that under the supposed reign of Jesus Christ—the just would be rewarded with sensual gratifications. So gross an idea never entered their mind: all sensual satisfactions they absolutely disavowed: nor did the greater part of them suppose the Millenarian system to be a point of faith. St Justin himself whom some have thought to incline that way—from an ambiguous expression in his dialogue with Tryphon—declares in plain terms, (*ibid.*) that there were many pious and orthodox christians of a contrary opinion.

Some moderns have erroneously contended, that the fathers generally held the Millenarian doctrine as a point of catholic tradition. Nepos indeed, who was a zealous and learned bishop of Arsinoë and who died in the communion of the church, propagated that mistaken notion in his vicinity, and wrote in defence of it two books entitled *On the Promises*. This work St Dionysius of Alexandria confuted by his two books against the Millenarian heresy. He moreover undertook a journey to Arsinoë, and held a public disputation with Coracion the chief of the Millenarians, in which he confuted them with equal strength of reasoning and moderation; and—with such success—that Coracion publicly revoked his error. It was absolutely exploded in that country, and was unanimously condemned—upon mature examination into the sound and uniform catholic tradition; which could not be affected by the disagreement of some few persons or particular churches. The Millenarian system has been revived by several Lutherans in Germany; and—among the English protestants—by Dr Wells, in his Notes on the Apocalypse; and by some few others; Johanna Southcote, &c.

Another kind of Millenarianism is mentioned by some writers which consists in the fancy that once every thousand years there

shall be a cessation of the pains of hell. This error likewise, originated in the misinterpretation of the Apocalypse.

MONOTHELISM—a term of Greek derivation signifying the doctrine of but *one will* in Christ. Athanasius its author was patriarch of the Jacobites or Eutychians in Syria. In Christ he acknowledged two distinct natures, the Divine and the human; but only one will. This Demi-Eutychianism is a glaring inconsistency; for the will is an essential property of the nature: and Christ himself sometimes speaks of his human will as distinct from the Divine; for instance, in his prayer during his agony in the garden. This Monothelite heresy which seems to have been invented as an expedient to compound with Eutychianism, the emperor Heraclius confirmed by an edict called *Ecthesis*, or the Exposition; declaring that there is only one will in Christ, namely, that of the Divine Word: it was condemned by pope John IV. Cyrus bishop of Phasis, a bigotted Monothelite, was by Heraclius preferred to the patriarchate of Alexandria in 629. Here St Sophronius, prostrate at his feet, in vain besought him not to publish his erroneous sentiments. Travelling thence into Syria in 634, this servant of God was elected patriarch of Jerusalem; and in the course of the same year he assembled a council of all the bishops of his patriarchate—to condemn Monothelism and composed a synodal letter—to explain and prove the catholic faith. This learned epistle, afterwards approved in the sixth general council, he sent to pope Honorius, and to Sergius of Constantinople. The latter, by an insidious letter and captious expressions, had persuaded pope Honorius to recommend a mysterious kind of silence on the subject, conformably to the intentions of Heraclius. It is evident, notwithstanding, from the most authentic monuments, that Honorius never assented to that error, but always adhered to the truth. (See Nat. Alex. sæc. 7. Witsasse and Tournely, Tr. de Incarn.) However, his silence was ill-timed, and might be deemed a species of connivance; and he himself together with Sergius and the other chief abettors of Monothelism, was by name condemned in the sixth general council, celebrated at Constantinople in 680. Thirty years afterwards, the emperor Philippicus patronised anew the cause of Monothelism; but he reigned only two years; and, under Leo the Isaurian, the heresy of the Iconoclasts caused that of the Monothelites to sink into oblivion: the remnants of the sect were confounded with the Eutychians.

MONTANISTS—were the adherents to the tenets of Montanus. This man was a convert and a native of Mysia on the confines of Phrygia, whose disappointed ambition to occupy the first dignities of the church, impelled him to impugn its doctrines. He commenced prophet, and began, in an enthusiastic strain, to ut-

ter extraordinary expressions. Prisca or Priscilla, and Maximilla, two women of quality but of abandoned morals, left their husbands, and, like Montanus, affected a mysterious kind of jargon; pretending that they succeeded the prophets. Montanus ranked himself above the apostles, and said he had received the Paraclete, or the Holy Ghost, promised by our Redeemer to perfect his new law of the gospel. He denied that the church had power to forgive the sins—of idolatry, of murder and impurity; and hardly would admit any sinners to repentance. St Paul had allowed second marriages. Montanus prohibited them, as inconsistent with the perfect law of chastity; and he forbade christians to flee in time of persecution. Thus did this hypocritical innovator affect a severity of doctrine, to which his manners did not correspond. His followers were also denominated from their native country—Cataphryges, and Pepuzeni from Pepuzium, a little town in Phrygia which was their metropolis; and which they called Jerusalem. (Euseb. l. 5. c. 17. St Hier. ep. 54. ad Marcel. Tert. l. de Fugâ. de Pudic. &c.)

The Montanists boasted of their martyrs, as did also the Marcionites; a thing not very ordinary with sectarists in general, as St Ireneus and Origen remark; nor indeed could these with any plausibility support their high pretensions. Asterius Urbanus, one of the writers that undertook a refutation of their errors, positively affirms, that the Montanists never had had any martyrs, and that among the few whom they pretended to be such, some had paid a sum of money for their enlargement out of prison, and the rest had suffered for real crimes. Apollonius, another catholic author, quoted by Eusebius, confounding the hypocrisy of the Montanists, reproached their pretended prophetesses with infamous debaucheries. And “does a prophet,” exclaims this ancient writer, “colour his hair, paint his eyebrows, play at dice, or lend out money upon usury? Of these things I will prove them to be guilty.” Their pretended prophecies and errors being condemned as impious, the followers of Montanus were excommunicated. Montanus himself, and Maximilla, agitated by the evil spirit that possessed them, afterwards—according to a popular tradition when Eusebius wrote, laid violent hands upon themselves.

These enthusiasts pretended that, besides the fast of Lent observed by catholics, there were other fasts *imposed by the Divine Spirit*. Accordingly they kept three Lents in the year, each of two weeks,—and upon dry-meats, as necessary injunctions of the spirit—by the new revelations made to Montanus which they preferred to the writings of the apostles; and they said, these laws were to be observed for ever. The great Tertullian, as St Jerom informs us, resenting some affronts which he imagined had been put upon him by the Roman clergy, in revenge became a Montanist; forgetting in his passion those

maxims by which he had himself triumphantly refuted all heresies—both of past and future ages. (See his admirable book of *Prescriptions*, &c.) Nor does his prevarication take from the solidity and acuteness of his former arguments, any more than the fall of Solomon can affect the excellence of his former inspired writings.

A certain protestant writer in 1751,* undertook to shew, that the Montanists had been ranked in the class of heretics without sufficient reason. But Mosheim vindicates the justice of their condemnation, 1st, because it was a very reprehensible error to pretend—to teach a morality more perfect than that of Jesus Christ; 2nd, it was not less unpardonable to attempt to persuade the people—that God himself spoke by the mouth of Montanus; 3rd, it was the Montanists that separated from the church, rather than the church that expelled them from its pale: it was on their part an intolerable pride—to pretend to establish a society more perfect than the church of Christ, and to nick-name the members of her holy communion *Psychici*, or *sensual animals*. And is it not somewhat singular, that Mosheim, in arguing thus against the Montanists, was not aware of the argument being perfectly applicable to his own dearly-beloved Lutheranism?

The Montanists divided into various branches. SS. Epiphanius and Augustine speak of the *Artotyrites*, the *Ascites*, &c. (See those articles.) Some of them adopted part of the dreams of the *Valentinians* and *Markesians*. The *Passalorynchites* or *Pettalorynchites* lay mighty stress on the ceremony of putting their fingers upon their noses and into their mouths—during prayer, and almost always when they had their hands at liberty,—to signify their extraordinary recollection and religious silence. St Jerom tells us, that some of these still subsisted in Galatia; who were the object of certain imperial ordinances—so late as the commencement of the fifth age: such is the delirium of fanaticism!

MORAVIANS. See ANABAPTISTS.

N

NAZAREANS—were a sect equally obnoxious to Jews and Christians. They allowed Christ to be the greatest of the prophets; but said he was a mere man, whose natural parents were Joseph and Mary: they joined all the ceremonies of the old law with those of the new, and observed both the Jewish Sabbath,

and the Sunday. Mosheim in his ecclesiastical history affects to blame St Epiphanius, for placing the Nazaréans on the list with heretics. If then, they denied the divinity of Jesus Christ, and in spite of the decisions of the council at Jerusalem still persisted in the superstitious observance of the Jewish ceremonies, were they notwithstanding, in the eyes of the protestants, very orthodox ?

NESTORIANS—the followers of Nestorius, a monk and priest of Antioch, who was promoted to the see of Constantinople in 428. The retiredness and severity of his life, joined with the exterior of apparent virtue, a superficial learning and a fluency of words, had gained him some reputation in the world. The study of the fathers he had neglected ; was a man of weak judgment, extremely vain, violent and obstinate. Such is the character which he bears in the history of those times, and which is given him by Socrates and Theodoret. The latter he had formerly imposed upon by his hypocrisy. Marius Mercator informs us, that immediately upon his preferment, he began to persecute with great fury—the Arians, the Macedonians, the Manichees and Quartodecimans, whom he caused to be banished from his diocese : while he himself denied the necessity of grace, and—on that account—received to his communion Celestius and Julian, though previously condemned by the popes Innocent and Zozimus, and exiled by the emperor Honorius, for Pelagianism. Theodosius, however, commanded them to leave Constantinople, notwithstanding the protection of the bishop. Nestorius himself soon began to teach new errors—from the pulpit ; maintaining there were two persons in Christ, that of God, and that of man, joined only by a moral union ; by which, he said, the Godhead dwelt in the humanity, merely as in its temple. Hence he denied the incarnation, or—that God was made man ; and said, the Blessed Virgin ought not to be styled the mother of God, but only of the man who was Christ ; whose humanity was no more than the temple of the Divinity,—not a nature hypostatically assumed by the Divine Person ; though at length, overruled by the common suffrage of antiquity, he allowed her the empty title of mother of God ; but continued to deny the mystery. At these novelties the people were not a little shocked ; and the priests St Proclus and Eusebius, bishop afterwards of Dorylœum, with many others, separated themselves from his communion, after having in vain attempted to reclaim him by remonstrances. His homilies every where excited clamour—against the errors and the blasphemies which they contained. St Cyril of Alexandria having read them, sent to him a mild expostulation ; but was answered with haughtiness and disdain. Pope Celestine being applied to by both parties, examined his doctrine in a council at Rome,—and pronounced

a sentence of excommunication and deposition against the author, unless within ten days after notification of the sentence he publicly condemned and retracted it; appointing St Cyril his vicegerent in this affair, to see the sentence put in execution. (Conc. T. 3. p. 343. Liberat. in Breviar. c. 4.)

St Cyril, together with his third and last summons, sent to Nestorius twelve propositions, accompanied with as many anathemas, hence called his *anathematisms*,—to be signed by him as a proof of his orthodoxy. But Nestorius appeared more obstinate than ever. This occasioned the calling of the third general council opened at Ephesus in 431 by two hundred bishops—with St Cyril at their head, as legate and representative of pope Celestine. (St Leo, Ep. 72, c. 3. Conc. T. 3, p. 656, 980.) Nestorius, though in the town and thrice cited, refused to appear. His heretical sermons were read, and depositions were received against him; after which his doctrine was condemned, and the sentence of excommunication and deposition was pronounced against him, and notified to the emperor.

Six days after this, John, the patriarch of Antioch, arrived at Ephesus with forty-one Oriental bishops; who secretly favoring the person—not the errors of Nestorius, of which they deemed him innocent—had advanced but slowly on their journey to the place. On their arrival, instead of communing with the council, they assembled apart, and presumed to excommunicate St Cyril and his adherents. Both sides applied to the emperor for redress, by whose orders St Cyril and Nestorius were soon after both arrested and confined; but Cyril was the worst treated of the two. He was even upon the point, through the greater interest of his antagonist at court, of being banished—when three legates from pope Celestine;—Arcadius and Projectus—bishops, and Philip a priest,—arrived at Ephesus. This gave a new turn to affairs in St Cyril's favor. The three legates having considered the proceedings of the council, the condemnation of Nestorius was confirmed; Cyril's conduct was approved; and the sentence pronounced against him was declared null and invalid. He therefore was enlarged with honor. The Orientals, notwithstanding, persisted in their schism—till the year 433, when they made their peace with Cyril, condemned Nestorius, and gave a clear and orthodox exposition of their faith. The heresiarch retreated from Constantinople to his monastery at Antioch; where John, though formerly his friend, finding him very perverse and obstinate in his heresy, and attempting to pervert others, entreated the emperor Theodosius to remove him. In conclusion, he was banished to Oasis, situate in the desert of Upper Egypt, on the borders of Lybia, in 431; and there ended his days in misery and impenitence. His sect remains to the present time very numerous in the East.

After the condemnation of his doctrine and of his person by the general council at Ephesus, Nestorius had still a multitude of obstinate abettors; particularly in the diocese of Constantinople, and in the provinces that lay contiguous to Mesopotamia. Proscribed and exiled by the Eastern emperors, they retired into the territories of the Persian kings; and were patronised by them out of enmity to their lawful sovereigns. A certain Barsumas, bishop of Nisibis, by his extraordinary influence at the Persian court, effected the establishment of Nestorianism over the different provinces of that extensive kingdom. Its sectaries, since the conquest of the Persian monarchy by the Mahometans in the seventh century, have uniformly enjoyed a larger portion of religious liberty than the catholics. This may be easily accounted for from the striking conformity between the Nestorian manner of speaking of Jesus Christ, and that of Mahomet in the Alcoran; a circumstance which they did not fail themselves to notice, in order to curry favor with the conquerors. (See Perpet. de la Foi, t. 4, l. 1, c. 5. and Assemani's Biblioth. Orient. t. 3, 4.)

Positive documents assure us that—so early as the year 540—Nestorianism had already reached the coasts of Malabar; and in the seventh age its missionaries penetrated into China; where the christianity introduced by them, subsisted, it is said, till the thirteenth century. The sect was also established at Samarcand and in other parts of Tartary, till the mighty and not less barbarous conqueror Tamerlane, planted on the ruins of all other systems of religion, the impious doctrines of Mahometism throughout the greatest part of Asia.

About the year 1500, when the Portuguese after having doubled the Cape of Good Hope, penetrated into the Indies, they were much surprised to find numberless small cantonments of Christians: nor were the latter less astonished at the arrival among them—of fellow christians from so remote a region. They called themselves *Christians of St Thomas*, and were then distributed in fourteen hundred boroughs along the coast of Malabar. They had but one pastor, who was a bishop or archbishop sent them by the Nestorian patriarch of Babylon, or rather, of Mozul, whom the sect had complimented with the epithet of *catholic*. Oppressed and persecuted by certain pagan princes of those parts, they implored the protection of the Portuguese, and notified to their patriarch the arrival of these strangers, as a very providential and extraordinary event. They ascribe their origin to the apostle St Thomas, from whom, they say—and not without some plausibility—they first derived their christian name and religion, and have constantly professed it down to the present time. They had been implicated in the errors of Nestorianism ever since the fifth century. The Portuguese missionaries conceived the design of reuniting them to the catholic church, from

which they had been separated upwards of a thousand years. The work was undertaken by Don John d'Albuquerque first archbishop of Goa, and prosecuted with success by his successor Don Alexis, aided by the society of St Ignatius. (See Govea's Hist. Orient. &c.)

Had the Portuguese continued peaceable possessors of Malabar, the whole christian population of those parts, it is more than probable, would have been catholic. But while the Dutch were in possession of it, they promoted the division—instead of seconding the efforts of catholic missionaries. M. Anquetil who travelled through that district in 1758, found the churches of Malabar divided into three partitions; the first catholic, of the Latin rite; the second also catholic, of the Syriac rite; the third was that appropriated to the use of the Syrian schismatics. Fifty thousand only, of two hundred thousand christians, were schismatics. P. Le Brun and La Croze had severally brought down their histories of these churches only to the year 1663, the epoch of the Dutch conquest of Cochin. M. Anquetil (*Disc. Prelim. du Zend Avesta*, p. 179) has continued it to the year 1758. He informs us, that in 1685 the schismatic Malabarians had been accommodated by their Dutch masters successively—with two archbishops, one bishop and one monk, from Syria; who were all Syrian Jacobites, and sowed their own errors among these ignorant people. Thus they exchanged their former heresy of above a thousand years prescription—for that of Jacobitism or Euty-chianism, without seeming aware of it themselves—notwithstanding the formal opposition of these two systems. In 1758 their archbishop was a Syrian monk—extremely ignorant—attended by a chorepiscopus little more enlightened than himself, who favored M. Anquetil with the sight of the Syriac liturgies, and allowed him to take down in writing the words of consecration. He afterwards delivered to him his profession of the Jacobite faith in the same language.

Mosheim and some other protestant writers, have in vain attempted to justify Nestorius and his sect from heretical opinions. The catholic doctrine declares, that in Jesus Christ there are two natures,—the Divine and the human; but only one *person*: that in him the humanity subsists—not by itself, but by the person of the Word to which it is substantially united; so that Jesus Christ is not a human, but a Divine person: otherwise he could not be denominated *God-Man* or *Man-God*; nor would it be true to say—that the Word was made flesh; was born of a woman; died, and redeemed us with his sacred blood, &c. Hence no sophistical explanations, no subtilty of logic will ever reconcile the opinions of the Nestorians, or their language, with Holy Scripture. Mosheim adds, that—to the immortal honor of the Nestorians—they alone, of all the christians of the East, have been always clear of that multitude of superstitious practices and

notions which have infected the Greek and Latin churches. They are however, accused of teaching with the Greeks—that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father only, and not from the Son; of denying with Theodorus of Mopsuestia original sin, &c. Would it not then have been for their *immortal honor*, to have first vindicated them from these serious charges? Mosheim doubtless wished to insinuate, that the Nestorians had never held the same doctrine with the church of Rome—concerning the seven sacraments, the real presence of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist, or Transubstantiation; the Veneration and Invocation of Saints, Prayer for the Dead, &c. But the learned Renaudot in the fourth book of the *Perpetuité de la Foi*; Assemani in his *Biblioth. Orient.* l. 3, part 2; Le Brun in his *Explic. des cerem. de la Messe*, t. 6, and Dr Hawarden in his *Church of Christ*,—have proved the contrary by documents the most incontrovertible; documents against which their adversaries are unable to produce even the shadow of an argument. Upon their first separation from the catholic church, the Nestorians used, and have *continued to use down to the present times*, the liturgy of Constantinople, which they translated into the Syriac tongue. Besides this they have other two; the first of which they term the liturgy of the apostles; and it appears, in fact, to be more ancient than Nestorius;—the other is that of Theodorus of Mopsuestia. That of Nestorius or of Constantinople—is the only one into which they have introduced their error concerning the Incarnation: the two former remain orthodox. In them, as in all the other Oriental liturgies without exception, we find the doctrines of the real Presence, Transubstantiation, the Commemoration of the blessed Virgin and of the Saints, Prayer for the Dead, &c. unequivocally noticed. These schismatics have always celebrated mass in Syriac—not in their vulgar tongue—wherever they have been established; and have always admitted the same number of sacred books with catholics. Whence it evidently follows, that in the fifth century when the Nestorian schism first commenced, the whole christian church professed the identical dogmas of belief, which protestants are now pleased to style—*new* doctrines unknown to antiquity, and—the mere inventions of the church of Rome.

In every age there have not been wanting zealous catholic missionaries who have attempted to reclaim these deluded people, and frequently with very great success. Many even of their patriarchs have at different periods declared themselves catholics, and have formally abjured their errors. Some indeed, it is to be feared, were not sincere: but it is by no means the case of all. One of these patriarchs called Abjesu or Abedjesu, went twice to Rome, repeated each time his abjuration, and sent his profession of faith to the council of Trent. He received the archiepiscopal pallium at the hands of the sovereign pontiff,

and on his return into Syria applied himself successfully to the conversion of his people. He was a person well skilled in the Oriental languages, and composed himself many useful treatises. In the year 1304, the patriarch Jaballah had caused an orthodox profession of faith to be presented, in his name, to pope Benedict XI. and in the sixteenth century John Sulaka, patriarch also—of the Nestorians, had done the same under the popes Julius III. and Pius IV. Abedjesu was his immediate successor. According to the gazette of France, (1771, 5th June, art. Rome)—the Dominican missionaries in Asia reconciled to the church the schismatical patriarch of Mozul, with other five Nestorian bishops of the same province. As to the invidious remarks of the Lutheran historian so often quoted, they are for the most part equally slanderous and groundless. But slander and misrepresentation, we are sorry to observe, are the usual weapons of those that quarrel with the catholic church.

NICOLAITES—ancient heretics, who scrupled not to eat meat offered to the idols, and held prostitution to be an act of virtue. (Apocalypse, c. 2. St Iren. l. 1, c. 27. Clem. Alex. Strom. l. 3.) Whether these sectaries really owed their origin to Nicolas the deacon, one of the seventy-two disciples of our Lord,—or only, like some other heretics, wished to add authority to their errors by fathering them upon a man of apostolic sanctity and character, ecclesiastical writers do not agree. Some authors have even expressed their doubts—whether any such sect had ever been in existence. This, however, is a notion diametrically opposed to all antiquity. They were a sensual race of men—ignorant and superstitious; who believed equally in evil spirits, and in the mysteries of christianity; and, for fear of offending the demons, they eat of meats consecrated to the heathen gods. The Nicolaites afterwards adopted the opinions of the Gnostics—respecting the primary origin of the universe. (See their article.) There was a species of Nicolaites so late as the seventh century; but, as their errors are not detailed, it is very possible the name may have been given to those clergymen, who after their ordination retained their wives—a practice not unusual in that age, though never sanctioned by the western church. (See Conc. Galliaë. t. p. 330.)

NOETIANS—so called from their author Noëtus, a native of Smyrna. About the year 240 this man began to teach—that there was but one person in God, who sometimes took the name of Father, sometimes that of Son,—and himself assumed our human nature;—was born of the Virgin, and died upon the cross. Being cited before his superiors, Noëtus disavowed his errors; but soon relapsed. He called himself Moses, and his brother Aaron. Praxeas and Sabellius afterwards maintained

the same errors with Noëtus ; (See their articles) though it does not appear that the Noëtians were ever very numerous. They were solidly refuted by St Hypolitus of Porto, who flourished at that period. Beausobre pretends (Hist. du Manich. t. 1, p. 535) that SS. Hypolitus and Epiphanius ascribed to Noëtus opinions which he never taught. But Mosheim (Hist. Christ. sæc. 3, p. 686) shows, that these two fathers of the church were perfectly right in their inferences ; that Noëtus's system evidently destroyed all distinction of persons in the Blessed Trinity, and that he held it inconsistent to admit three persons—without admitting also three Gods. What the English translator Mr Maclaine says upon this subject, is not less unreasonable than it is untheological. This gentleman, always excessively liberal in regard of sectarists, but ever the reverse when the conduct of the catholic church and its pastors is to be censured, blames the primitive fathers for opposing innovators with their own weapons, and giving by the aid of that philosophy which the latter abused, true and orthodox explanations—in opposition to their captious and sophistic arguments pointed against the chief mysteries of catholic faith ! Such is the injustice of some protestant writers ; such their obstinate and indecent enmity to their mother-church !

NON-CONFORMISTS—are the sects in Globo—so called from their *non-conformity* with the protestant church of England, established by law:—Puritans, Anabaptists, Quakers, &c. &c. See their articles.

NOVATIANS—the adherents of the first anti-pope Novatian. He had been a Stoic philosopher, and had acquired a considerable reputation for eloquence. At length he embraced the christian faith ; but deferred his baptism—till, in a dangerous fit of illness, he received the sacrament of regeneration lying on his sick-bed. He was afterwards ordained priest. During the persecution of Decius, instead of assisting his suffering brethren—as was expected of him—he kept himself in close retirement ; and, to do away all unfavorable impressions on the public mind from such a conduct, he afterwards affected an extreme of rigorism, and complained that some who had fallen in the persecution, were too easily readmitted to communion. By this pharisaical zeal he formed a small party, and counted some among the confessors who had been imprisoned for the faith, in his interest. He was much emboldened in his cabals by one Novatus a wicked priest of Carthage, who having strenuously abetted the deacon Felicissimus—in the schism which he raised against St Cyprian about the beginning of the year 251—to avoid the sentence of excommunication threatened by his bishop, fled to Rome, and there either first excited Novatian to commence an open schism, or

at least very much encouraged him to persevere. So notoriously were ambition and faction the character of this turbulent man, that though at Carthage he had condemned the conduct of St Cyprian towards the Lapsed as too severe, he was not ashamed to ground his schism at Rome upon the opposite principle; there censuring the self-same discipline of the church as a criminal relaxation of the law of the gospel.

To frame a clear conception of the controversy in question, it is necessary to observe, that those christians who in the persecution had offered incense to idols, were called *Sacrificati* and *Thurificati*; others who purchased with money of the imperial officers libels or certificates, as if they had actually offered sacrifice, (by which, indeed, they were guilty of the same scandal) were termed *Libellatici* or *Certificate-men*. All the Lapsed, upon giving marks of sincere repentance, were admitted by the church to a course of severe canonical penitence, which was shorter and milder with regard to the *Certificate-men* than to *Apostates*. The term being completed, or abridged by an indulgence of the bishop, they were finally received to communion. If any penitent during his penitential course happened to be in danger of death, the benefit of absolution and communion was granted him; and this discipline was confirmed by several councils—at Rome, in Africa and other places. At this Novatian took offence; pretending that the Lapsed ought never again to be admitted to penance, or to receive absolution,—not even after performing a regular course of penitence, or at the article of death. To his schism Novatian quickly added heresy; and maintained, that the church had not received from Christ the power of absolving sinners from the crime of apostacy, however penitent they might be. His followers afterwards taught the same with regard to murder and fornication; and condemned second marriages. They were called from him *Novatians*, and also *Cathari* or *Puritans*, as the rigid Calvinists have been denominated in latter times in England. Having already separated many persons from the communion of St Cornelius, he at length decoyed three ignorant and besotted bishops from a corner of Italy to Rome. These he prevailed upon while intoxicated, to ordain him bishop of that see. One of them returned soon after to his duty—confessing and lamenting his guilt, and was admitted by St Cornelius to lay-communion; although he still remained deposed from the episcopal dignity, as well as his two accomplices in this act of schism and of sacrilege; and the holy pope substituted other pastors in their place. Thus Novatian became the first anti-pope; and was acknowledged by none but heretics. He is called by St Cyprian—"a deserter from the church,—an enemy to every tender feeling,—a very murderer of penitence,—a teacher of pride,—a corrupter of the truth, and a destroyer of charity."

St Cornelius held at Rome a synod of sixty bishops, in which were admitted, according to the canons previously established, those Lapsed who sincerely implored admittance to public penance; and bishops and priests in the same circumstances—only to the rank of laics, without the privilege of exercising any sacerdotal function. Novatian, who was present and obstinately refused to communicate with such penitents, was himself excommunicated. The confessors, Maximus a priest, Urbanus, Sidonius, Celerinus and Moses, who had been imposed upon by Novatian, were undeceived by the letters of St Cyprian, and the evidence of truth; and were all received to communion by Cornelius—to the great joy of the people. (Cornel. ep 46 inter Cyprian, ed. Pam. 49, ed. Oxon.) The sect, notwithstanding, spread and was perpetuated in the East to the seventh age; and in the West it subsisted till the eighth. In the general council of Nice held in 325, the terms on which they were to be readmitted to communion, were fixed. One of their bishops called Acesius, disputed on the occasion with much vehemence; insisting upon the impropriety of admitting notorious sinners to repentance. Constantine, who was present at this council, cried out: “Bring then a ladder for yourself, Acesius; and mount up to heaven all alone.”

Novatian and his fellow-schismatic Novatus—desperate as is their cause—have their protestant advocates equally with most other enemies of the church of Rome. And indeed, it is provoking beyond all sufferance—to protestant bigotry—to observe its own errors reprobated and proscribed in Novatian and his abettors, at so early a period as the third century. Mosheim among others has in vain exerted all his rhetoric—aided, as usual, by misrepresentation, to palliate the guilt and impropriety of their conduct. The facts however speak a language which cannot well be misunderstood; and the attentive reader is himself enabled to pronounce upon the merits of the cause—without the imputation of rash judgment.

O

OPHITES or Serpentinians—a branch of Gnostics who imagined, that Wisdom had revealed itself to man—under the form of a serpent; and on that account paid to it divine honors. The wicked spirit, as we are informed in Holy Scripture, in the guise of a serpent prevailed with our first parents—to *eat of the fruit of the tree of knowledge of good and evil*; and after they had eaten, their eyes were opened in effect—to know good and

evil. Out of gratitude for this pretended service to mankind, these fools who deemed themselves wiser than the rest of mortals, worshipped the devil under his assumed serpentine appearance. They kept for the purpose a serpent in a cage; and, at the time appointed for the commemoration of so signal a benefit to the human race, they opened the cage, and called to the serpent. Presently he issued forth; crawled upon the table where the bread was placed for the intended sacrifice, and entwined himself about the loaf. This the maniacs, with much reverence, consumed as their eucharist, and as a perfect sacrifice. Having then adored the serpent, they offered—through him—a hymn of praise to the celestial Father, and thus concluded their absurd mysteries. (See Origen, l. 6. contr. Cels. p. 291 and 294, l. 7. p. 358. Philastr. c. 1. Epiph. Hær. 29. Damascen. c. 37. de Hær.)

Origen has handed down to us their prayer: it was an unintelligible jargon, somewhat resembling the gibberish of Alchemists. From this prayer, however, we may collect, that they supposed the world to be governed by we know not how many different powers; and that these imaginary powers had separated their respective world from those of other puissances; and that a soul in order to return to heaven, must find means to sooth them, or to elude their vigilance in travelling incognito from one world to another. They professed the most frantic enmity against our blessed Redeemer—who came into this world to crush the serpent's head; and of course they refused to admit among them any person, that did not first renounce Jesus Christ. Of this ridiculously impious sect one Euphrates was the author. Their rule of faith was—that of all reformers—*Scripture interpreted by private sense!*

ORBIBARIANS—were a sect that denied the mystery of the blessed Trinity, the resurrection, the last judgment and the sacraments: they believed Jesus Christ to be a mere man, and said he had not suffered. (D'Argentré, Collect. Jud. t. 1. Spond. ad an. 1192. Dup. n. 26.) These sectaries appeared about the close of the twelfth century: they were a kind of *Gypsies*, and probably derived their appellation from their vagabond and unsettled state of life. They seem to have been a branch of the Waldenses, and were condemned and excommunicated by Innocent III. (See WALDENSES.)

OREBITES—were a body of Hussites who, after the death of Zisca, placed themselves under the conduct of a Bohemian named Bedricus. They called themselves Orebites from their retreating to a mountain which they denominated *Oreb*.

ORIGEN—surnamed the *Impure* to distinguish him from the fa-

mous christian Origen,—taught about the year 290, that marriage was a device of the devil ; and in its place encouraged the unrestrained indulgence of all wickedness. His sectaries were every where held in execration : they subsisted, notwithstanding, till the fifth century. (Epiph. Hær. 63. Baron. ad an. 256.)

ORIGENISTS—those who abused the authority of the great christian philosopher Origen—in support of the anti-catholic doctrines,—that Jesus Christ is only the adoptive Son of God ; that the human soul pre-existed its union with the body ; that the torments of the reprobate would not be eternal ; that the wicked spirits themselves would one day be delivered from the pains of hell, &c. Certain Egyptian monks, with some of that profession in Palestine, adopted these errors ; maintained them with great obstinacy, and excited much disturbance in the church. This drew upon them the anathemas of the fifth general council held at Constantiple in 553 ; in which the person of Origen himself, as the supposed author of their heresy, was not spared.

The Origenists were at that time divided into two branches, neither of which held *all* the false opinions contained in the writings now ascribed to Origen. Those who maintained Jesus Christ to be no more than the adopted Son of God, held moreover, that at the general resurrection the apostles would be equalized with him, and on this account were called *Isochristæ*. Those who taught the pre-existence of souls, were denominated *Protocristæ*, epithets which designated the nature of their error. Why the latter were also called *Tettradites*, or persons who attribute a particular virtue to the number *Four*, does not appear. See the articles ABELARD, ADOPTIONISTS, DESTRUCTIONISTS, &c.

OSIANDRIANS—the followers of Osiander, a disciple of Luther. See the article LUTHER.

P

THE PACIFIC—were so called because, in adhering to the Henoticon of Zeno, they pretended—their motive was a love of peace. (See the article MONOTHELISM.) The Anabaptists likewise, took this name ; asserting, that their new system of religion would establish upon earth an eternal peace.

PALAMITES—the same with HESICASTES. See the article.

THE PERFECT—a usual epithet assumed by pretended reformers of catholic doctrine, and by those who affected extraordinary singularity in their religious exercises.

PASAGIANS—a name of Greek etymology, importing all perfection in those fanatics that deemed themselves entitled to it.

PASSALORYNCHITES—were a sect of Montanists. See the article.

PASSIONISTS and **PATRIPASSIANS**—those who pretended that God the Father had suffered. See **PRATEAS**.

PATARINI—a branch of Paulicians, so called from a street in Milan, where they settled in great numbers during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries: it was given indiscriminately to almost all the sectaries of those epochs.

PAULICIANS. See **MANICHEES**.

PAUL OF SAMOSATA—was made bishop of Antioch about the year 262. The famous queen Zenobia reigned at that period in Syria; and her court was the rendezvous of men of talents and learning. Among the rest, Paul also was invited by the queen, who admired his eloquence, and signified a desire to hear from him an account of the christian religion. She was a princess well versed in the knowledge of history, and a great proficient in the study of various languages. She preferred the Jewish religion before all others; but could not relish the mysteries of christianity. To do away her difficulties, Paul attempted to simplify the mysteries of our faith, and to render them intelligible to human reason. He told her that the three Persons of the most blessed Trinity—were not three Gods, but merely—so many attributes of the Divinity under which he had been pleased to reveal himself to men; and that Jesus Christ—was not God, but a mortal man to whom the Divine Wisdom had communicated himself in an extraordinary manner. (Epiph. Hær. 65. Hilar. de Synod. p. 136.)

At this new doctrine the faithful took the alarm, and freely uttered their complaints. But Paul, who was one of the most haughty of mankind, and whose vanity procured hymns to be sung in his own praise even in the churches, was not disposed to give them satisfaction.

However, seeing himself on the point of being condemned in a council held at Antioch in 264, he disavowed his errors, and thus escaped personal censure. The synod dissolved, and Paul renewed his heresy; for which he was anathematized and deposed in a second council, convened also at Antioch, in 270,

by the unanimous voice of the assembly. He refused to surrender the episcopal residence—till the downfall of his protectress Zenobia, when, upon the application of the catholic bishop, the conqueror and Roman emperor, Aurelian, decreed that the episcopal house should be adjudged to the person, to whom the bishops of Rome should have addressed their letters of communion; concluding very rationally, that if any individual refused submission to the decisions of his religious superiors, he ought from that instant to renounce all claim to what belonged to them. (Theodoret, Hæret. Fab. l. 2, c. 8.) Upon this principle he accorded to the catholics—that protection which the laws hold out to every subject indiscriminately,—aiding him to drive from his premises the unjust intruder; and to every society—in order to the expulsion of such members as it dislikes, or who refuse obedience to its rules. But he did not punish the refractory bishop by depriving him of the rights of a citizen; nor did the catholics require it.

The Antiochian synod having thus condemned the innovating doctrine, together with its author, wrote circular letters to all the churches of the christian world—to inform them of its proceedings; and they were received with general approbation. Consequently, the divinity of Christ was at that early period distinctly professed; and the smallest deviation in the generally received doctrine affecting it, was deemed heretical and destructive of religion. The sentiments of Paul relative to this great and fundamental article of christianity, were indeed precisely the same with those of Theodotus in the preceding century: the same arguments were by him urged in their defence: they were combated in both instances with the same principles, and with similar effect. No traces of either sect were visible towards the close of the fifth age; nor had they ever been considerable for their numbers or respectability. However, St Lucian of Antioch seems to have been deceived by the subtle reasoning, or rather the crafty dissimulation of his master Paul; and, as we are informed by St Alexander of Alexandria, remained for some years separated from the communion of the catholic church. The Arians even boasted, that Arius had received his doctrine from him; but he is justified with regard to that aspersion—by the panegyrics of St Chrysostom and St Jerom; by the express testimony of the ancient book *On the Trinity*, among the works of St Athanasius (tom. 2, p. 279); by his own orthodox confession of faith in Sozomen, (l. 3, c. 5, p. 502) and by the authority of the church, which from his death has always ranked him among its illustrious martyrs.

PELAGIANS—Pelagius was by birth a Briton, as we are informed by St Augustine, St Prosper and Marius Mercator; and was a monk of Bangor in Wales. His name in the lan-

guage of his country was Morgan; which abroad he changed into the Greek word of the same import Πηλαγίος from Πηλαγος the *sea*. (See Usher. Antiq. c. 8.) He travelled into Italy, and lived a long time at Rome, where he acquired a reputation for virtue. Falling in with Rufinus the Syrian, a disciple of Theodosius of Mopsuestia who came to Rome about the year 400, he learned from him the errors which he began immediately to propagate—though at first in private—against the necessity of Divine grace. He wished first to find out—how the people were disposed to receive his doctrine, before he openly committed himself; and he sounded them by means of his disciples: the chief of these was Celestius—a man, according to Mercator, nobly born, assuming, and of a subtle ready wit. He was a Scotchman and is called, somewhat vulgarly, by St Jerom—“a fellow bloated with Scottish gruels” or crowdies; meaning, we suppose, to censure in him the want of that spirit and practice of mortification, becoming his profession of a monk. He had joined Pelagius at Rome; and a little before that city was taken, passed with him into Africa in 409. Pelagius went soon into the East; but left Celestius at Carthage, where he entered himself among the candidates for the priesthood. Meanwhile Paulinus, the deacon of Milan, who was then in Africa, preferred against him an accusation of heresy to Aurelius bishop of Carthage, about the beginning of the year 412. Aurelius assembled a council in that city, to which Paulinus presented two memorials—charging Celestius with holding the following errors: that Adam would equally have been mortal and have died, though he had not sinned;—that his sin was prejudicial to himself alone, not to his posterity;—that children are now born in the same state in which they would have been, if Adam had never sinned; and that, if they die without receiving baptism, they nevertheless obtain eternal life.

Celestius was heard; and notwithstanding all his evasions, he confessed enough to be convicted of obstinate error; so that he was finally condemned and deprived of ecclesiastical communion. Before the close of the same year, the great St Augustine undertook the refutation of Pelagianism. This, however, he did—without naming the authors of that heresy, in order the more easily to reclaim them. Pelagius himself he even praised—in a book which he wrote against his errors, and says: “As I understand, he is a holy man very far advanced in christian virtue—a good man, and worthy of praise.” (l. de merito Peccat. et Remiss, c. 1. 3.) But—after his condemnation, Orosius and other fathers accuse him of loving banquets and the baths, and of leading a life of softness and sensual indulgence. He made a long stay in Palestine; and in 415, was summoned to appear before certain bishops at Jerusalem; who thought fit to write to the pope for information in this affair, and to abide by his an-

swer. However, in December the same year, a council of fourteen bishops, among whom was John of Jerusalem, was held at Diospolis or Lydda; in which Pelagius was obliged to appear and give an account of his faith: two Gaulish bishops who had been expelled from their sees, Heros of Arles, and Lazarus of Aix, were his accusers. Pelagius escaped personal condemnation by subscribing to the condemnation of his errors. But this he did—with certain mental reservations—so as to deceive the synod; for, in fact, he never altered his opinions. (St Aug. l. de gestis Pelag. c. 20.) After this, his vanity was at its zenith; and he boasted loudly of his imaginary victory; although he durst not show the proceedings of the council, because the people would have seen in them, that he had been compelled to disavow his tenets. He contented himself with writing to his friends; informing them that fourteen bishops had approved his doctrine; which asserted—that a man may live without sin, and may *easily* keep the Divine commandments, if he will. But he did not say—that he had added in the council these words—with the grace of God: and he superadded in his letter the word *easily*, which he had not dared to affirm before the synod, as St Augustine observes. The bishops of Africa were too well acquainted with his artifices to be imposed upon; and, assembling two councils, one at Carthage, the other at Milevis, in 416, they wrote against him to Pope Innocent, who—with commendations of their pastoral vigilance, in 417 declared Pelagius and Celestius excommunicated: for he perceived, that the answers of the former in the council of Diospolis were no way satisfactory; as appears from the epistolary correspondence between him and St Augustine upon this affair. Pelagius wrote to Rome in his own justification; and Celestius, who had got himself ordained priest at Ephesus, went thither in person, where Zozimus had succeeded Innocent in the papal chair in March 417. To him Celestius presented a confession of faith, in which he was very explicit on the first articles of the creed, and professed that—if in some of his letters he had advanced any thing erroneous, he submitted it to his judgment, and begged to be set right. Pope Zozimus had so much regard to his pretended submission, that he wrote in his favor to the African prelates; though he would not take off the excommunication which they had pronounced against Celestius, but deferred passing sentence personally for two months. In the mean time St Aurelius assembled in 418, a council at Carthage, of two hundred and fourteen bishops; which renewed the sentence of excommunication against Celestius, and declared its firm adherence to the decree of pope Innocent.

Zozimus having received their letters of information, condemned the Pelagians, and cited Celestius to appear again. The latter secretly withdrew from Rome, and returned into the East;

thus demonstrating the insincerity of his late professions of submission, and his pretended wishes *to be set right*. Upon this Zozimus published a solemn sentence of excommunication against both Pelagius and Celestius, and sent it into Africa, and to all the principal churches of the East. Eighteen Italian bishops refusing to subscribe the letter and sentence of pope Zozimus, were deposed. The most learned of these, as well as the most obstinate, was Julian of Eclanum in Campania, which see is now removed to Avellino. His writings show him to have been one of the most self-conceited of human beings; full of pride and a contempt of all other men, but of quick parts and abundance of ready wit.

The chief errors of Pelagianism, as is plain from what has been said above, regard original sin and divine grace: the former they denied, with the necessity of the latter. They also affirmed that a man—independently of grace—could live entirely exempt from sin; and they extolled the virtues of the heathens. The contrary truths of the catholic faith St Augustine maintained with invincible force; and he proved from the clearest passages of Holy Scripture, that all men are sinners, and bound to pray for the pardon of their sins: for, without an extraordinary grace, (such as was given to the Virgin Mary) even saints offend by small transgressions of a faulty inadvertence; against which they watch, and for which they live in daily compunction. He also proves, that the virtues of heathens are often counterfeit; for instance,—whenever they are influenced with motives of vain glory, or other vicious qualities: they are true *moral* virtues, and may deserve some temporary recompence if they spring purely from principles of moral honesty. But no virtue can be meritorious of eternal life, which is not animated by divine charity, and which is not produced by a supernatural gift of grace. He teaches, that the divine grace obtained for us by our blessed Redeemer, works in us the consent of our will to all virtue, though not without our free concurrence; so that all the good that *can* be in us, is to be attributed to the Creator; and no one ought to boast of his good works by contrasting them with those of other men. But God cannot be the author of evil: this arises entirely from the malice and defect of rectitude in the free will of the creature; to whom nothing remains—without the Divine concurrence—but the wretched power of self-depravation and corruption, or at most, of doing that from self love, which ought to be done for God alone. It cannot—without grace—do any action, of which God is the supernatural end, nor of which, by consequence, He will be the final recompence.

Through the corruption of human nature by sin, pride being become the darling passion of our heart, men are born with a propensity to Pelagianism, or principles which flatter an opinion of our own strength, merit and self sufficiency. We cannot

therefore be surprised, that this heresy found advocates; rather, it is wonderful it should have had no more. The wound would certainly have been much deeper and more severely felt by the church of God, had not Divine Providence raised up so eminent a doctor of his grace, as was St Augustine, to be a bulwark for the defence of the truth; and to him is the church indebted, as to the chief instrument of God in overthrowing this heresy.

From its ashes sprang Semi-Pelagianism, the authors of which were certain priests, bishops and monks in Gaul,—at Lerins, and in other parts in the vicinity of Marseilles. St Prosper and Hilarius, two zealous and learned laymen, informed St Augustine by letter in 429, that these persons expressed the utmost admiration for all his other actions and words; but took offence at his doctrine of grace, as if it destroyed free-will in man. They taught, that the beginning of faith, and the first desire of virtue, are from the creature, and move God to bestow that grace which is necessary for men to execute and accomplish good works. They said, that as to children who died without baptism, and those infidels to whom the faith is never preached, the reason of their misfortune is—that God foresees they would not make a good use of longer life, or of the gospel; and that he on this account deprives them of those graces. St Augustine wrote two books against this error; one entitled *On the Predestination of the Saints*; the other *On the Gift of Perseverance*; showing that the authors of this doctrine did not recede from the great principle of Pelagianism, and that, to ascribe to the creature the beginnings of virtue, is in reality, to give the whole to it and not to God. He treats the Semi-Pelagians as brethren, because they erred without obstinacy; and their error had not been yet condemned by any express definition of the church. The principal persons who espoused it, seem to have been—Cassian at Marseilles, and certain monks of Lerins. It was condemned in the second council of Orange under St Cæsarius in 529, confirmed by pope Boniface II. in a letter to that saint.

The famous Vincent of Lerins has been falsely classed by some in the list of Semi-Pelagians. There were two other Vincents living at Marseilles at that very time; and, very possibly, there were many others of the same name, one of whom may have been a Semi-Pelagian, whence the mistake in all appearance originated. At all events, it is certain, that Vincent of Lerins condemned Semi-Pelagianism with great warmth, and highly extolled the letter of pope Celestine to the bishops of Gaul. To guard the faithful against the dangerous snares spread on every side in order to seduce them, and to open the eyes of those already seduced by the false and perplexing glosses of subtle refiners, St Vincent, with great clearness and force of reasoning, wrote a book in the year 434, which he entitled *A Commonitory against Heretics* in general. The saint here lays down as a

rule and fundamental principle in which he found by a diligent enquiry—all catholic pastors, and the ancient fathers, to agree ;—that such doctrine is truly *catholic*, as hath been believed—in *all places—at all times—and by all the faithful*. (Conc. c. 3.) By this test of universality, antiquity and consent, he says, all controverted points in belief must be tried. He shews that—while Novatian, Donatus, Arius, Pelagius, &c. expound the Divine oracles different ways,—to avoid confusion and the perplexity of errors, we must interpret the Holy Scriptures by the tradition of the catholic church, as the clue to conduct us in the truth: for this tradition derived from the apostles, manifests the true meaning of the Holy Scriptures; and all *novelty* in faith is a certain mark of heresy. He adds, that new teachers who have made bold with one article of faith, will proceed to others; and what will be the consequence of this reforming of religion, but only, that these refiners will never have done reforming till they have reformed it quite away, (c. 29.) Of this there cannot be a more striking exemplification than the conduct of our modern innovators.

St Vincent elegantly expatiates on the Divine charge given to the church, to maintain inviolate the depositum of faith. (c. 1. 27, p. 30.) He observes that, in the works of Paul of Samosata, Priscillian, Eunomius, Jovinian and other heretics, (and we may include in the list—those of the present day) almost every page is painted, and overcharged with scripture texts. But in this, he says, they are like those poisoners or quacks, who put off their destructive potions under the inscriptions of good drugs, and under the title of infallible cures. They imitate the Father of Lies, who quoted scripture against the Son of God. (c. 31, 32.) If a doubt arise in interpreting the sense of scripture in any point of faith, we must summon in the holy fathers, who have lived and died in the faith and communion of the catholic church; and by this test we shall prove the false doctrine to be *novel*: for that alone we must look upon as indubitably certain and unalterable, which *all or the major part* of these fathers have delivered, like the harmonious consent of a general council. But if any one among them, be he ever so holy, ever so learned, holds any thing besides, or in opposition to the rest, it is to be placed in the rank of singular opinions, and never to be deemed the public general authoritative doctrine of the church. (c. 33.) Can any thing be more rational than these principles; more *scriptural*, or equally secure?

PEREANS—the followers of one Euphrates of Pera, in Cilicia, who pretended there were three fathers, three Sons, and three Holy Ghosts. To these sectaries the symbol termed the Athanasian creed seems to allude in the versicle which sets forth—that there is but one Father, not three Fathers; one Son, not three

Sons; one Holy Ghost, and not three. (Theodoret, *Hæret. Fab.* l. 1, c. 18, Philast.)

PETROBRUSIANS—took their name from Peter Bruys, a native of Dauphiné. He was yet young when he commenced *reformer*, and began by a very austere and singular method of life to gain a reputation, though the writers of that age accuse him of disguising most wicked actions, and corrupt morals—under a hypocritical garb. He went very meanly clad; and his ordinary retreats were the cottages of peasants. Having a ready tongue, he first gained attention by declaiming against the riches, and the luxury of the clergy; and afterwards boldly sowed his errors in Provence, Languedoc and Gascony. Peter the Venerable, abbot of Cluni, who wrote against them, reduces them to five: he denied the validity of infant baptism; condemned the use of churches and altars, and, wherever his rabble was sufficiently strong, pulled them down: rejected the mass; denied that alms and prayers avail the dead, and forbade the singing of the Divine praises in churches: reprobated the veneration of crosses; broke them in pieces, and made bonfires of the wood, on which he boiled large pots of broth and meat, to regale his hungry followers and vagabond adherents. Abelard (*Introduct. ad Theol.* p. 1086) and other contemporary writers give the same account of his tenets. He passed from province to province, attended by a lawless banditti—pillaging the churches, demolishing crosses, and destroying the sacred altars, as they advanced. The profanation of places of worship, and the re-baptising of their deluded proselytes—were the favorite occupations of these frantic hypocrites. At length, however, their infuriated author was arrested and condemned for his seditious conduct to be hanged, and his body burnt.

Protestants have made a holy martyr of this enthusiast, and have ranked him in the class of sanctified reformers. He has indeed as good a right as his fellows of more modern date, to the boasted title. But it is rather singular that those should claim him for their precursor, who are the avowed enemies of the Anabaptist system. To what inconsistencies are people often driven, when they wish to trace the pretended succession of their religion—through the medium of such characters as was Peter Bruys! (See the article **HENRY BRUYS**.)

PHOTINIANS—the adherents of Photinus, a native of Galatia, and disciple of Marcellus of Ancyra. Marcellus had zealously opposed, together with St Athanasius, the Arian system, and had written against that faction a book entitled—*On the Submission of Jesus Christ*, in which were some expressions favorable to Sabellianism. He was accordingly accused of holding the opinions of Sabellius, and condemned by an Arian council in

336. A sentence of banishment was pronounced against him by the emperor; and he withdrew to Rome. Pope Julius admitted him to communion, and pronounced him innocent of the charge alleged against him, in a council held in that city upon the occasion. Photinus, however, imagined that the sentiments of Marcellus really inclined to Sabellianism, and himself adopted the real or, in all probability, only the supposed principles of his former master. He maintained with Sabellius, that the Word was a mere attribute; and denied his hypostatic union with the humanity. (Epiph. Hær. p. 71. Vincent. Lyrin. Commonit. c. 16. Soz. l. 4, c. 6, &c.)

The errors of Photinus were immediately condemned by the Oriental bishops, in a council at Antioch in 345; and by the Western prelates in 346. He propagated his heresy in Illyria; but his sectaries were not numerous, and did not long survive their author. See SABELLIANS, NOETIANS, PRAXEANS and PAUL OF SAMOSATA.

PHOTIUS. See GREEKS.

PRAXEANS—had for their author one Praxéas a Phrygian, who coming to Rome under pope Victor towards the close of the second century, informed him of the errors of Montanus, and afterwards began himself to sow there a new heresy; maintaining but one person in God, and attributing crucifixion to the Father as well as to the Son; whence his followers were called PATRIPASSIANS. Tertullian has refuted this error with great energy and solidity of argument. He opposes to the Praxéan heresy the doctrine of the universal church, which had condemned its author, and with which, says he, we believe in one only God, at the same time that we profess our belief in the Divine Word his only Son, who proceeds from Him, and by whom all things were created; and that without Him nothing actually exists; that this Divine Word was sent down from heaven by the Father, and took flesh of the Virgin;—God and man at the same time, son of man and Son of God:—that he was surnamed Jesus Christ; and that he suffered death, and was buried: such, continues he, is the faith which the church enforces, and has uniformly professed since the commencement of christianity. Clerk and some other modern Arians and Socinians have, by forced constructions and unnatural hypotheses, in vain endeavoured to render doubtful the opinions of Tertullian with regard to the divinity of the Son of God.

PREDESTINARIANS—are all those—of whatever sect—that blasphemously affirm all reprobates to have been doomed by Almighty God from all eternity to sin and hell—without the power of avoiding either. This most impious heresy was an-

ciently condemned by the councils of Arles and Lyons—about the close of the fifth century. Towards the middle of the ninth, it was renewed by a wandering monk of the diocese of Soissons, named Gotescalcus. Rabanus Maurus archbishop of Mentz, one of the most learned and holy men of that age, condemned his errors in a synod held in that city in 848, and sent him to his own metropolitan Hincmar archbishop of Rheims, a prelate also, of great learning and abilities. By him and Wenilo, archbishop of Sens, and several other prelates, he was again examined in a synod held at Quercy on the Oise, in 849. Gotescalc proving refractory, was degraded from the priesthood, and closely confined in the abbey of Hautvilliers, in the diocese of Hincmar. However, by the advice of St Prudentius, whom Hincmar consulted upon the occasion, he was not deprived of lay-communion, till Hincmar found his obstinacy incorrigible; and he issued against him a sentence of excommunication; under which this unhappy author of much scandal and disturbance died, after twenty-one years of rigorous confinement, in 870. With a variety of other exploded heresies, our modern reformers, Luther, Calvin, Beza and a countless tribe of their deluded adherents, have revived Predestinarianism—not to speak of the infidel Mahometans, who have always held the absurd and impious doctrines of absolute fatality. Bishop Usher too, with Jansenius and Mauguin, is an advocate for Predestinarianism. Their vindication of Gotescalc is confuted by the Cardinal de Laurea, (Opusc. 1. c. 7) Nat. Alexander, Honoratus of St Mary, and Tournely, in accurate dissertations on that subject. The Divine predestination of the elect is an article of catholic faith; but such a grace and predestination as destroy free-will in the creature, are a monstrous heresy. In disputing, however, upon either of these subjects, we walk upon the brink of two precipices; and without the utmost caution it is easy to take a false step, and to fall headlong into an abyss. Hence it happened that the adversaries of Gotescalc were thought by some to lean too much the other way; and this gave occasion to much wrangling and mutual crimination—between parties who agreed in sentiment, but for some time could not satisfy each other of their orthodoxy. It was the case of Hincmar, Rabanus Maurus, and St Prudentius, on the one side; and Ratramnus, Amolon, St Remigius, &c. on the other; though all alike censured the errors of Gotescalcus, as well as the opposite doctrines of Pelagius.

PRESBYTERIANS—they that assert the government of the church to belong—not to *bishops*, but to *Presbyters* or *ruling Elders*; and that there is no *order* in the church of *divine institution* superior to that of a Presbyter; who therefore hath power to ordain ministers by fasting, prayer and imposition of hands,

They have three courts—1. That composed of the minister of each parish, with his elders, and the congregation.—2. That of the Presbytery; consisting of a great number of ministers and elders, associated for governing particular churches.—3. The highest court 'is a synod, which, they hold, may be provincial, national, or oecumenical; and allow of appeals from the lesser to the greater. They baptise by sprinkling; and their common worship consists in extemporary prayer, preaching and singing of psalms. (See *Bibliotheca Technologica*, p. 34.)

Rigid Calvinism was first introduced into Scotland in the reign of queen Elizabeth, by John Knox and his fellow gossellers on their return from Geneva; and was some time afterwards improved into its present form, designated under the general denomination of *the Kirk of Scotland*. The Presbyterians however are not confined within the limits of that country; but have established themselves also in the north of Ireland, in some of the North American states, and in England—where under the name of Puritans, Independents, &c. they overturned the existing government, and raised their general Oliver Cromwell to arbitrary power under the title of Protector. Since the restoration they have been here gradually on the decline, and at the present day form but an inconsiderable part of our English protestant Dissenters. (See the article CALVINISTS; also that of AERIUS, under which we have refuted their doctrine respecting the equality of order and jurisdiction in the ecclesiastical hierarchy, &c.)

PRISCILLIANISTS—an infamous sect of the fourth age, who renewed many errors of Simon Magus, the Gnostics, and the Manichees; to which they added their favourite tenet of dissimulation and lying; it being an avowed principle with them rather to commit perjury itself, than to reveal the abominable tenets of their sect. 'Swear, forswear thyself, said they, in order to conceal thy sentiments.' One Mark, a Manichee, coming from Memphis in Egypt into Spain, spread the poison of his errors in Galicia. His first disciple was a lady of distinction, who brought over to the party a rhetorician named Elpidius. These two persons taught Priscillian, who gave name to the sect. He was rich, and well born; had fine parts; was eloquent, curious and inquisitive; had read much, and acquired a large stock of profane learning. His vanity kept pace with his knowledge; and he was of a hot and restless temper. This man tainted with his errors several persons of quality, and a great number of the common people, especially females; and his obliging carriage and affected gravity gained him much esteem.

With Sabellius—the Priscillianists confounded the three Divine Persons in the Trinity; said that Christ is the *only-begotten* Son of God—in as much only, as he was the only Son of Mary;

for that God had many other sons. They taught that Christ assumed our human nature, was born and suffered merely in appearance ; that every human soul is a portion of the Divine substance, and pre-exists the state to which it is condemned in the body : that the devil, or author of evil, was not created by Almighty God, but sprang from darkness and the chaos, and is evil by his own nature. Marriages they condemned and dissolved, and in lieu of matrimony authorised obscenities ; qualifying their adultresses and harlots with the soft epithet of adoptive sisters. They did not reject the Old Testament, but explained it allegorically. To the books of the New Testament they added false acts—of St Thomas, St Andrew, and St John ; and two most blasphemous books, the one written by Priscillian, called *Memoria Apostolorum* ; the other called *Libra*, or the Pound, because it consisted of twelve questions or blasphemies. This book they ascribed to one Dictinius. To conceal their doctrine, they were ready, if necessary, to abjure even Priscillian himself—together with their own tenets, as we are assured by St Augustine. (Ep. 237, n. 3, &c. See also St Leo's Letter to Turibius, 15. ed. Quesnell, p. 93. The first council of Toledo, Conc. T. 2, p. 228 ; the council of Braga, in 563, T. 5, p. 36. &c.)

Two bishops named Instantius and Salvianus were seduced by Priscillian ; Higinus of Cordova their neighbour at first opposed, but afterwards joined them. The two former, with Elpidius and Priscillian laymen, were condemned in the council of Saragossa—subscribed by twelve bishops in 381. The execution of the sentence was committed to Ithacius bishop of Ossobona (formerly an episcopal see in Lusitania, now called Estombar in Algarves) who was ordered by the council to excommunicate Higinus also. Ithacius is much commended by some writers for his eloquence ; but is charged by Sulpicius Severus with the odious vices of gluttony, adulation, haughtiness and revenge. Instantius and Salvian, after their condemnation, proceeded to ordain Priscillian bishop of Avila. Ithacius and Idacius his colleague, exasperated the sect by the violence of their proceedings ; and, through their procurement, the emperor Gratian issued an order for the banishment of the Priscillianists. Instantius, Salvian and Priscillian applied to pope Damasus for redress, and perverted many in Aquitain on their way to Rome ; particularly one Euchrocia, wife of Delphidius a famous poet and orator, and her daughter Procula, whom Priscillian is said to have debauched. Pope Damasus refused to see them, and Salvian dying at Rome, the other two repaired to Milan, and were rejected in like manner by St Ambrose. But they found means by dint of bribery and court intrigue to obtain of Gratian their re-establishment in their episcopal sees. Ithacius remained at Triers till Maximus became master of Spain ; who listened to his complaints, and

caused Instantius and Priscillian to appear before a council at Bourdeaux. Instantius was condemned; but Priscillian appealed to Maximus; and they were both sent to him at Triers by the connivance of the synod. Doubtless, they were afraid of offending this new master should they have rejected the undue appeal. Maximus committed the cause of the Priscillianists to Evodius, whom he had made prefect of the prætorium. This severe judge convicted Priscillian of several crimes by his own confession; among others, for instance, of holding nocturnal assemblies with lewd women; of praying naked, and other such scandalous immoralities. Ithacius was the accuser, and was even present when Priscillian was put to the torture: though after this he withdrew, and did not assist at their condemnation to death. Evodius laid the whole proceeding before Maximus, who declared Priscillian and his accomplices worthy of death. The sentence was accordingly pronounced; and Priscillian, his two clerks named Felicissimus and Armenius, Latrocinus a layman, and the adulteress Euchrocia, lost their heads; and many others were variously punished for the same cause. Ithacius and his associate bishops were patronised by the emperor; so that several who highly disapproved their conduct, durst not openly condemn them. However, neither St Ambrose nor St Martin would communicate with Ithacius, or those bishops who held communion with him. Nor can we be surprised at this refusal—when we consider how much the church abhors the shedding of the blood—even of criminals, and never suffers any of her clergy to be party in such cases.

After the defeat of Maximus by Theodosius in 338 or 339, Ithacius was brought to a trial, and having been convicted of seditious and irregular behaviour, he closed his life in exile, and under the severest censures of the church. The wretched Priscillian and his fellow miscreants were honored by their deluded followers in Spain as martyrs; and their bones were conveyed thither, as so many precious relics. The sect was repressed by the severe laws of Honorius in 407 and 408, and by the zeal of the holy pope St Leo, and of St Turibius, bishop of Astorga in 447; and quite annihilated in Spain by the invasion of the Moors, (see Tillemont, Orsi, &c.) although they still subsisted in some other parts of Christendom; as is evident from a council held against them at Prague in the sixth century. (Collect. Conc.) See the Life of St Martin of Tours by the learned Alban Butler, T. 11, p. 215, &c.;—the article MANICHEES, &c.

PROCLIANS—were Montanists who received their name from a certain Proclus, a leading man of that sect: see the article.

PRODIANITES otherwise HERMIANS: see that article.

PTOLOMEANS—the followers of Ptolomy a disciple of Valentinus, who maintained with him the doctrine of a Being sovereignly perfect; but rejected his system of the origin of the world and of the Jewish dispensation. He taught, that the Jewish, and the evangelical law, were derived from the good Principle, and not the work of two hostile divinities; and that the world was not the production of the Supreme Being; otherwise, in his ideas, there could have been no evil. Hence he concluded, that the Creator was a good Principle residing in the centre of the universe, which he had created, and in which he produced all possible good; but that in this same world there existed also, an unjust and evil Principle which was united to matter, and was the author of evil. It was to prevent the consequences of His inbred malice, that the Creator had sent down amongst us his divine Son. But this wise reasoner has not thought fit to let us know—how his supposed evil Principle which had not from itself an independent existence, came into existence at all, if all things received their being from one Principle sovereignly perfect!

PROTESTANTS—a name first given to the adherents of Luther, because in the year 1529 they *protested* against a decree of the emperor and the diet of Spire, and appealed to a general council. At their head appeared six princes of the empire, namely: John, elector of Saxony; George, elector of Brandenburg; Ernest and Francis, dukes of Lunenbourg; Philip, landgrave of Hesse, and the prince of Anhalt. They were seconded by thirteen imperial cities. This league, however, was formed rather with a view to set bounds to the authority of the emperor, than in opposition to the catholic religion. The appellation of protestants was likewise given to the disciples of Calvin in France, and was extended to the various branches of the *reformed*, whether Lutherans or Calvinists;—the Church-of-England-men, or the numerous sects into which they have since divided. We have spoken of each under their respective articles; we will here examine their general claim to orthodoxy.

If they be asked—where was their religion before Luther and Calvin were in being, they will answer—in the Bible. It must then have lain there very close and snug; since for fifteen slow-revolving centuries none had ever discovered it, before these sagacious gentlemen dragged it into light. You are much deceived, they will exclaim: the Manichees, like ourselves, discovered in scripture the idolatry of paying religious honors to the martyrs; Vigilantius, the abuse of venerating their relics; Aërius, that of praying for the dead; Jovinian, the superstition of vowing a state of virginity. Berengarius, as well as ourselves, saw clearly in the gospel, that the dogma of transubstantiation was absurd; the Albigenses, that the pretended sacra-

ments of the church of Rome, were but empty ceremonies; the Valdenses and others—that priests and bishops differ not in authority or character, from simple laics, &c. Consequently, we can prove our belief to have been always professed, either in the whole, or at least in part, by some or other society of christians; and that it is wrongfully accused of innovation.

Behold here a tradition with a witness—the most pure and respectable that ever was adduced! Ever to be sought for without the pale of the church, it has for its guarantees none but sectaries anathematized for their impious tenets. But why not grace the honourable pedigree with the additional suffrage of the Gnostics, the Marcionites, the Arians, the Nestorians, the Pelagians, Eutychians, and the Lord knows how many other equally creditable progenitors? All alike have seen in holy scripture their errors and their absurdities; *they* maintained as well as protestants, that this Divine book was a sufficient rule of faith. But by what peculiar evidence are *protestants* convinced, that themselves recognise in holy writ more certainly than all these eminent theologists of old, those articles of belief in which they think proper to dissent from them? To point out pretended *witnesses of the truth*, and never fully to agree with their testimony; to adopt their sentiments on some particular point, and reject them in every other instance, is not the way to add much weight to their authority. A creed thus made up of patch-work, and of materials purloined from ancient heretics, a multitude of whom were no longer christians, nor worshippers of Jesus Christ, can bear but a very scanty resemblance with the doctrine of that Divine master.

If the Bible in fact contained—all the errors which fanatics of every age have pretended to deduce from it, it would be the most pernicious book in existence: nor would the Deists, on this supposition, be wrong in affirming it to be a bone of contention, destined to set all mankind at variance. However, as protestants will have the privilege of giving it what sense they please, they certainly should not refuse the same prerogative to other sects: hence all possible errors and heresies, evidently are justified by the protestant rule of faith—the *private interpretation of scripture*. But, we should likewise wish to know—why the catholic church is not also allowed the privilege, in her turn, of discovering from holy scripture, that all who relinquish her communion, pervert the sense of that Divine book, which itself was entrusted to *her* exclusive charge by the apostles her original founders? St Peter admonishes us, that the sense of scripture may be perverted by the ignorant and unstable, to their own destruction, ep. 2, c. 3, 16; and how does this stand with the protestant maxim, that all are capable of interpreting it for themselves? Tertullian informs all sectaries, that scripture is the exclusive property of the true church, to which aliens can

have no just pretensions. (Præscrip. c. 37.) It concerns the protestants to prove, that this exclusion does not affect themselves.

PUCCIANITES—are those who adhere to the doctrine of one Puccius, who pretended that Jesus Christ, by his death, had satisfied in such manner for all mankind, that whoever should have a natural knowledge of God, although they had no faith in Jesus Christ, would be saved. This doctrine he maintained in a treatise which he dedicated to pope Clement VIII. in the year 1592—with the following title: *De Christi Salvatoris efficacitate in omnibus et singulis hominibus, quatenus homines sunt, assertio Catholica æquitatis Divinæ et humanæ consentanea, universæ Scripturæ S. et PP. consensu, spiritu discretionis probata, adversus scholas asserentes quidem sufficientiam Servatoris Christi, sed negantes ejus salutarem efficaciam in singulis, ad summum Pontificem Clementem Octavum.* (Stockman. Lexic. Puccianiste.)

Rhetorius in the fourth age had held nearly the same opinion, and Zuinglius in the fifteenth. It may, very possibly, be an error of the heart; but it is formally opposed to the words of Jesus Christ himself, who says, that *no man cometh to the Father but through Him*, (John xiv. 6.) and again,—*I pray not for the world, but for them whom thou hast given me . . . and for them also, who through their word shall believe in me*, (c. xvii. 9, 20.)

PURITANS—were a sect of rigid Calvinists in England, who affected to aspire after greater perfection, than they acknowledged to be attainable in the church established by queen Elizabeth; and quarrelled with the popish ceremonies, episcopacy, and other rites,—still retained to the intolerable scandal of these more precise and pharisaical gospellers. The contest between them and the established church terminated in the eventual subversion of the existing government, and of the throne itself—by the murder of their lawful sovereign Charles I. They had begun early to divide into various classes—of Brownists; Separatists; Robinsonians, and the numerous sects of Independents. Even the most ignorant, and the very dregs of the populace became preachers, as is now the case among Methodists and Quakers; and the gaping mob was all credulity and attention. The pulpits every where were filled with what the parliament termed “a godly, faithful, painful, gospel-preaching ministry,” who railed against the alleged malignancy, treachery, barbarity, superstition, popery and idolatry of their predecessors in office, with as little decency or regard for truth, as the catholics had before experienced in the common anniversary discourses on the fifth of November. They did not, however, long retain their power; for Cromwell growing tired of their yoke, put himself at the head of those, who were for a more perfect equality and inde-

pendency in church affairs, than the Independents themselves. His Highness in person sometimes mounted the pulpit, and new modelled the Scriptures as he had modelled the laws, to the views of his own ambition. In the end, however, when this usurper found himself assailed with the extravagances of the Quakers of those times, and the anarchical ravings of the Fifth-monarchymen, who would admit of no other ruler but Christ himself; and of other frantic enthusiasts each of whom—with his Bible in his hand—was ready to demonstrate his own senseless system to be the only one therein revealed, he of course felt the fatal consequences of that unlimited right of interpreting the Scripture, which he had hitherto supported. Dr Featly, an eminent divine quoted by Grey, complains heavily of the licentiousness in question. “There is not, says he, the meanest artizan or the most illiterate day-labourer, but holds himself sufficient to be a master-builder in the church of Christ. I wonder that our doors and walls do not sweat when such notices as these are affixed to them:—*On such a day such a brewer’s clerk exerciseth, such a tailor expoundeth, such a waterman teacheth.*” So fond were the common soldiers of shewing their gifts this way, that they declared that “*if they might not preach, they would not fight.*” One of these military preachers went into the church of Walton upon Thames with a lanthorn and five candles;—declaring to the people that he had a message from God, which they must receive upon pain of damnation. He first announced—that the Sabbath was abolished, and put out one light; next, that tythes also were abolished, and put out the second light. He then proceeded to declare that church ministers and every species of magistracy were abolished,—putting out his third and fourth lights; and lastly, that the Bible itself was abolished; which he burnt with his fifth light, and then extinguished it. See Exam. of Neal, vol. iv. pp. 61, 62. The same author furnishes the most extraordinary instances that can be conceived—of the prevailing blasphemies, impieties, crimes and follies proceeding from the unrestrained licence which every one then claimed, of expounding the Scriptures for himself; though not greater than what happened at the commencement of the reformation in Germany and Holland. Salmon, a preacher at Coventry, taught his people to curse and swear, and commit whoredom. At Dover a woman cut off her child’s head, pretending a special command from God—like Abraham. Another woman was condemned at York in March, 1647, for crucifying her mother, &c. Other extravagances were as laughable as these were awful. Some have killed their cats for catching mice on a Sunday, but scrupulously deferred the execution till Monday, for fear of incurring similar guilt; nay, one Precisian, as he is called, knocked out the head of his barrel of beer for working on the Sabbath day! An in-

stance of the former kind gave occasion to the following ludicrous verses :

Veni Banbury, O profanum !
 Ubi vidi Puritanum
 Felem facientem furem,
 Quia Sabbato stravit maurem."

Ibid. pp. 92, 101.

They may be very literally, though not very poetically, rendered thus :—

Arrived at Banbury, O profane !
 I there beheld a Puritan
 In pious rage hang up Tom Cat,
 For catching on Lord's Day a rat.

See the above in Mr Milner's vii. Letter to Dr Sturges. Since the epoch alluded to, the Puritans and Independents have gradually dwindled into non-existence at this period, and their very name is a memorandum of reproach with all sober-minded christians. See LUTHER, and the immediate effects of what is called the reformation under that article ; ANABAPTISTS, &c.

Q

QUAKERS—the followers of George Fox. This man, by profession a shoemaker, in the reign of Charles the First began to hold forth—against the established clergy,—against the luxury of the age,—the lawfulness of war, of oaths, of taxes, &c. At a time when England was involved alike in civil and religious anarchy, it is natural to expect he would find adherents ; and he quickly became the author of a sect. Taking in the strictest literal sense all the moral precepts and the councils of the gospel, he maintained it absolutely unlawful—to take an oath, to enter into law-suits, to bear arms, engage in war, &c. He taught that all mankind are equal ; that exterior marks of respect, such as moving the hat, bowing, and the like civilities, must be laid aside as idle ceremonies—tending only to flatter pride in persons of high rank, and contrary to christian simplicity and candor : he therefore ordered all his followers to address even the most exalted in dignity—with the familiar pronoun Thou, and never compliment them with their usual titles of—*Your Lordship, Your Worship, Your Majesty*, and so on. He said that God gives to every man an interior light, sufficient to

conduct him to eternal life—without the aid of priests or any ministers of religion; and that each individual—man or woman—is qualified and authorised to instruct and preach, as soon as they shall feel themselves inspired so to do—in formal opposition to St Paul, who forbids *women* to open their mouths in the assemblies of the faithful. Fox also teaches, that the doing of good, and avoiding of evil, are alone sufficient to secure our salvation—without either sacraments, the use of ceremonies, or of any exterior worship at all; and that modesty and temperance are the most essential virtues of a christian, which require the retrenchment of every superfluity in dress—of buttons, for instance, and ribbons, and lace in the ornaments of the sex, &c.

One of the first apostles of Quakerism—was William Penn, only son of the vice-admiral of that name; a young man of a pleasing aspect, joined with great parts and natural eloquence. This youth became fellow-preacher with George Fox; and with him he undertook a mission into Holland and Germany. In Holland they succeeded tolerably well in forming some few disciples, known by the name of *Prophets*, or *Prophesiers*. Their success in Germany was less considerable. In England, however, the spiritual conquests of Fox were more extensive; and he there had trained a prodigious multitude of He and She evangelists, whom he sent with his pastoral letters—not only to every place where his sect had previously obtained any footing, but to all the sovereigns of the universe;—to the king of France, the German emperor, and even to the Turkish sultan, &c. commanding them, on the part of God, to embrace his gospel doctrine: these letters were conveyed into the most distant parts of the globe—by troops of men, women, and almost infant apostles of both sexes; who backed them with their own spontaneous effusions, but, alas!—to little purpose! At home, these new reformers traversed in the paroxysm of their zeal our towns and villages; furiously declaiming against Episcopacy and Presbyterianism; in a word—against all established religions indiscriminately. “They ridiculed the public worship; insulted the ministers in the time of Divine service; contemned alike the authority of the laws and that of the magistrates,” says Mosheim; “alleging for the motive of their conduct—inspiration! Thus they excited in church and state the most alarming commotions; nor can we be surprised, if the civil power was at length obliged to employ the severest coercive measures against these turbulent fanatics.” Ecclesiastic. Hist.

After the death of his father, William Penn obtained of the king, in lieu of what remained due to him from government on his father's account—the grant of an entire province in America, which from him was called Pennsylvania. Thither he conducted a colony of his disciples; built for them the city of Philadelphia; and himself became their legislator. Notwithstanding

their aversion for war, they have been, more than once, compelled to take up arms against the savages who invaded their possessions, and to repel force with force.

In England the Quakers are not now so numerous as formerly, nor so unsociable. The more enlightened part begin to see the absurdity of that stern and Pharisaical contempt for the innocent and received usages of their fellow-men; and that such odious singularity renders even virtue itself ridiculous. Quakers, like all other sects, have also varied in their doctrine. Those of Pennsylvania, who enjoy absolute liberty in both civil and religious matters, have likewise stretched licentiousness of sentiment much farther than their English brethren, in proportion as the latter have always been restrained by the ruling sect, and by the severity of government. Many among the former have adopted opinions the most impious; and vast numbers of them have degenerated into open Deism.

The parallel which some moderns have been pleased to trace—between Quakerism and primitive christianity,—is absurd, and rests upon assertions utterly devoid of truth. They pretend, that the Pennites, in refusing baptism, have Jesus Christ himself for their surety, who, they falsely say, never administered it to any man; for Jesus Christ has positively ordered his disciples to baptise all nations. If then he neglected to baptise his apostles, he himself, it must be said, has violated his own ordinance. Himself assures us, that unless a man be born again *of water* and the Holy Ghost, he shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven. Can the Spirit of Truth and Jesus Christ contradict each other; or rather, is not Fox's *internal* spirit evidently the spirit of error and imposture? They say, again, that the primitive christians were all equal, as Quakers too affect to be. This also, is a false assertion: did not the apostles exercise authority over the rest of the faithful? Did they not establish pastors to whom they transmitted that authority, and to whom they commanded laics to submit? Did they not order all to be obedient and submissive to magistrates and princes, and to those in power? These indeed, our Quakers have more than once insulted, even on their judicatory tribunal; and have constantly refused them the smallest demonstration of respect. The first disciples, continue these parallelogists, received the spirit, and spoke in the assembly; they had neither temples, nor altars, nor ornaments, nor tapers, nor any ceremonies at all. Fox and his disciples have only imitated them. Here, again, the disparity is palpable: the inspiration of the primitive christians is demonstrable from the miraculous gifts with which it was accompanied. But how do our pretenders to primitive christianity demonstrate their's? St Paul, moreover, laid down rules for regulating the use of these very gifts in christian assemblies; and expressly prohibited *women* from preaching and in-

structing there ; and it is plain from the apocalypse, that even in the time of the apostles, christians had their altars, their ornaments, and their incense ; their tapers, and their ceremonies. We prove also, against protestants in general, and unbelievers in globo, that from the infancy of the christian church, seven sacraments have always been admitted. (See LUTHER.) Nor is an apparent gravity and austerity of demeanour any better proof of the orthodoxy of a sect : they have been found repeatedly—in sectaries whom Quakers themselves would condemn as fanatics and false teachers : they are sometimes found in heathens and Mahometans ; sometimes, even in Atheists. Their principles are wrong ; the foundation of true *faith* is wanting, without which, St Paul informs us, *it is impossible to please God*. We are prepared to give them credit for their moral virtues, although Mosheim and his translator exert their utmost ingenuity to render them suspected ; but they cannot, of themselves, entitle their possessors to supernatural reward. We sincerely pity their delusion, and wish them no other harm, than that of opening their eyes and heart to see, and to embrace with ardor, the *true christianity*.

With regard to the profession of arms, which Quakers disallow in christians, it is not in itself unlawful. St John the Baptist commanded soldiers to *do violence to no man* . . . and to be content with their pay, Luke iii. He did not enjoin them to abandon their profession : when Jesus Christ himself commended the faith of the centurion, he did not reprobate his calling, Matt. viii. St Paul recommends to every one to continue in the state of life in which he was engaged when first called to the faith ; soldiers are not excepted, 1 Cor. vii. Tertullian testifies that in his time the camps and armies were full of christians, and that they were good soldiers since they were not afraid of death. (Apol. c. 37, 42.) If in other places he seems to prohibit the military profession to christians, it is only because at that time an unlawful oath was tendered to them at their admittance. But when this grievance was done away, the third canon of the council of Arles excommunicated those who should desert even in time of peace. Constantine was then emperor ; and christian soldiers were no longer in danger of prevarication, as such serious inconveniences did not then exist. (See Bellarm. t. 2. Controv. de Laicis.) The lawfulness too, of paying taxes, our blessed Saviour himself has sufficiently declared : *render*, says he, *to Cesar the things that are Cesar's*, (Matt. 22.) and St Paul—*tribute to whom tribute is due*, (Rom. xiii.) Oaths likewise—under due circumstances, are justified by the example of the great Lawgiver himself—*the Lord hath sworn, and it shall not repent him*, (Ps. 109.) and they are also commended when taken by *men* in a reverent and respectful manner, *all they shall be praised who swear in him*, (Ps. 62.) Even the angels *swear by Him that liveth for ever and*

ever, as we are informed in the Revelations. What our blessed Lord says seemingly against oaths of any kind, is to be understood of all rash, inconsiderate and unnecessary swearing—in common conversation, for instance, or in passion. With Quakers we most cordially agree, that *law-suits*, on account of the danger of injustice or uncharitableness, ought, if possible, to be avoided by christians; and that it would be better to suffer wrong than to offend in either instance.

QUARTODECIMANS—those who after the general council of Nice, obstinately continued to celebrate the paschal solemnity on the fourteenth day of the moon of March. This deviation from the general rule, tolerated in the church without any breach of communion, had subsisted a considerable time—when it began in the pontificate of pope Victor, to be canvassed with greater warmth than heretofore. Asia Minor, alleging the example of St John the evangelist, observed it on the fourteenth day of the moon, with a few neighbouring provinces. “The universal church, if we except these provinces,” says Eusebius, “had affixed the solemnity of the resurrection to the Sunday exclusively.” Many councils were convened upon this disparity of practice; and they were all unanimous in confining the Easter solemnity to the Sunday. This universality of sentiment was opposed by Polycrates bishop of Ephesus, one of the most eminent prelates of the church at that time, and the first among the Asiatics: Victor requested him by letter, as he had done with regard to the rest of the principal pastors, to assemble the bishops of his province, with a threat of excommunication if he persisted to op-pugn the general sentiment. Polycrates assembled them accordingly; and they were all determined like him, to adhere to what they thought the tradition of their predecessors. Victor was prevailed upon to proceed no farther: but in 325 the controversy was decided by the general council of Nice; and those were qualified *schismatics* who refused submission to the synodical decree. If any held the practice of celebrating Easter on the fourteenth of the moon to be of precept from the Jewish law, such were always classed by the church with *heretics*. The Scotch or Irish, in the fifth and sixth centuries, kept Easter on a Sunday;—not, like the Quartodecimans and Jews, on the fourteenth day, unless when this fourteenth day coincided with the Sunday: by which circumstance they differed widely from the practice condemned at Nice; yet fell short of perfect conformity with the universal church.

If any of the apostles who lived among the Jews, tolerated for some time a coincidence of Easter with the Jewish Pasch—a fact by no means clearly proved,—at least the contrary rule was always the general discipline of the church,—a rule established by the apostles—to show, that christians were not bound by the

Jewish ceremonial law, and distinctly to assert the liberty of the gospel, in the same manner as they transferred the Sabbath to the Sunday. See Butler's *Lives of the Saints*, vols. vii. p. 383-4. and x. p. 254-5, ed. Edin. in the lives of St Victor P. M. and St Wilfrid the elder. See also the article *CULDEES*.

QUIETISM—The heresy and fanaticism broached by Michael Molinos, a Spanish priest and spiritual director previously in great repute at Rome, who in his book entitled, *The Spiritual Guide*, established a pretended system of *perfect contemplation*. "It turns chiefly upon the following general principles. 1. That *perfect contemplation* is a state in which a man does not *reason*, or reflect either on God or himself; but passively receives the impression of heavenly light without exercising any act; the mind being in a perfect state of inaction and inattention, which this author terms *Quiet*. This principle is a notorious illusion and falsity; for even in supernatural impressions or communications, however a soul may be abstracted, and insensible to external objects which act upon the organs of the senses, she still exercises her understanding and will,—in adoring, loving, praising, or the like pious affections, as is demonstrable both from principle, and from the testimony of all true contemplatives. 2. This fanatic teaches, that a soul in that state desires nothing,—not even its own salvation; and fears nothing,—no not even hell itself. This principle, big with pernicious consequences, is heretical; as the precept and constant obligation of hoping for salvation through Christ, is an article of faith. The pretence, that a total indifference is a state of perfection, is folly and impiety; for solicitude about things of duty is a precept: nor can a person ever be exempt from the obligation of that charity, which he owes both to God and himself, and by which he is bound above all things to desire, and to labor for, his own salvation and the eternal reign of God in his soul.—A third principle of this author is no less notoriously heretical;—that in such a state the use of the sacraments and good works becomes indifferent; and that the most criminal representations and motions in the sensitive part of the soul, are foreign to the superior, and not sinful—in this elevated state; as if the sensitive part of the soul were not subject to the government of the rational or superior part; or, as if the latter could be indifferent as to what passes in the other. Some affirm, that Molinos carried this last principle so far, as to authorize the abominations of the Gnostics; but the generality of divines excuse him from so foul an imputation. (See F. Avrigny, *Honoré of St Mary*, &c.) Innocent XI. in 1687, condemned sixty-eight propositions extracted from this author, as respectively heretical, scandalous and blasphemous. Molinos was condemned by the inquisition at Rome; recalled his errors,

and ended his days in confinement in 1696." (See d'Argentré, *Collect. judiciorum de novis erroribus*, T. 3, part 2, p. 402, &c. also Mr Butler, in the life of St John of the Cross.)

SEMI-QUIETISM—was patronized for some time by the great Fenelon. Madame Guyon a widow-lady of great piety and wit wrote *An easy and short Method of Prayer*, and *Solomon's Canticle of Canticles interpreted in a mystical sense*; for which by order of Lewis XIV. she was confined in a nunnery; although soon after she was enlarged. She next published *The Old Testament with Explanations*, *Her own Life* by herself, with other works—all written with spirit and a lively imagination. Her doctrine she submitted to the judgment of Bossuet, then esteemed the most accurate theologian in the French dominions. After a mature examination Bossuet with cardinal Noailles, Fenelon, then lately nominated archbishop of Cambray, and Mons. Tronson, superior of St Sulpice, drew up thirty articles concerning the sound maxims of a spiritual life; to which Fenelon added four others. These thirty-four articles were signed by them at Issy in 1695. (See Argentré's *Collect. Jud. de nov. error.* T. 3. Du Plessis, *Hist. de Meaux*, T. 1. p. 492. *Memoires Chronol.* T. 3. p. 28.) During this examination, Bossuet and Fenelon had frequent disputes—for and against—disinterested love, or divine love of pure benevolence. The latter in some measure undertook the patronage of Madame Guyon, and in 1697 published a book entitled *The Maxims of the Saints*; in which a kind of Semi-Quietism was advanced. The clamor raised on this occasion drew the author into disgrace at the court of Lewis XIV. and the book was condemned by Innocent XII. in 1699, on the twelfth of March; and by the author himself, on the ninth of April following. Together with the book—twenty-three propositions extracted from it were censured by his holiness—as rash, and in practice pernicious, as also respectively erroneous; but none were qualified *heretical*.

The principal error of Semi-Quietism consists in the following doctrine:—that in the state of perfect contemplation, it belongs to the entire annihilation in which a soul places herself before God, and to the perfect resignation of herself to his will, that she be indifferent whether she be damned or saved: which monstrous extravagance destroys the obligation of christian hope. The divine precepts can never clash, but confirm each other. It would be blasphemy to pretend, that because God, as a universal ruler, suffers sin, we may therefore take a complacency in beholding it committed by others. No one is damned but for sin and final impenitence; and while we adore the Divine justice and the awful severity of his decrees, we are bound to reject sin with the utmost abhorrence, and deprecate damnation with the greatest ardor; both which, by the Divine grace we have it in our power to avoid. Where then can there be any

room for such a pretended resignation, at the very thought of which piety must shudder? No such blasphemies occur in the writings of St Teresa, St John of the Cross, or in other approved spiritual authors. If they seem to be expressed in certain passages of some spiritual works, as those of Bernieres, &c. these expressions are to be corrected by the rule of solid theology. Fenelon was misguided chiefly by an adulterated edition of the spiritual entertainments of St Francis of Sales, published at Lyons in 1628 by Drobet. Yet this faulty edition, with its additions and omissions, has been sometimes reprinted!"

"Some advised Fenelon, in his turn to charge his adversary with heterodox opinions, and to impeach him at Rome of an attempt to establish theological hope upon the ruins of Divine charity. But the pious archbishop made answer, that he never would inflame a dispute by recriminating a brother, whatever might have seemed prudent to be done in other circumstances. When reminded of the insincerity of the human heart which he had so often himself experienced, he replied: *Let us die in our simplicity.* In effect, some of those who carried the point against him, were condemned, by the public voice, for their want of charity in their method of carrying on the contest; while Fenelon, who erred in theory, was misguided—only by an excess in his most ardent wishes to obtain it."

"As to the distinction of the motives in our love of God, too nice or anxious an enquiry is, in practice, generally fruitless and pernicious: our business is—more and more to die to ourselves,—to purify our hearts, and employ our understanding in the contemplation of the divine perfections and heavenly mysteries, and our affections in the various acts of holy love;—a boundless field in which our souls may freely take their range. And while we blame the extravagances of false mystics, we must never fear being transported to excess in our love of God. It can never go too far; since the only measure of our love of God ought to be—to love without measure, according to the remark of St Bernard. Let but humility and obedience accompany it, and we shall not ultimately miss our way." (See Butler's Lives of the Saints, vol. xi. p. 432, 3, 4. Ed. Edin.)

R

REBAPTISERS—a name given by their opponents to those, who maintained the necessity of re-baptising all heretics. The Novatians re-baptised all their proselytes indiscriminately; and St Cyprian decreed, that the Novatian converts to the catholic

church—were, in their turn, to be re-baptised upon their admittance to communion. This error was adopted by the Donatists in the fourth age, and by the Anabaptists in the sixteenth.”

“ It had been the constant doctrine of the catholic church, that baptism given in the evangelical form; that is, in the name of the three Divine Persons of the most Blessed Trinity, was valid, though conferred by heretics. This was the practice even of the African church, till Agrippinus, bishop of Carthage, in the close of the second century introduced the change, fifty years before St Cyprian, as St Augustine and Vincent Lirinensis testify; and St Cyprian himself appeals only to a council held by Agrippinus, for the origin of his mistaken tradition. (Ep. 73, ad Jubaian. n. 3.) Led by this erroneous principle, St Cyprian, in three African councils, defined, that baptism conferred by any heretic is of course invalid; which decision he founded on this false maxim—that no one can receive the Holy Ghost by the ministry of a person, who does not himself possess him in his soul. This fallacious reasoning would equally go to prove, that no one in mortal sin can validly administer any sacrament: whereas, Christ himself being the principal though invisible minister in the administration of the sacraments, neither faith, nor the state of grace is required in the administrator—in order to its validity; though both are necessary to preserve him from the guilt of sacrilege. St Cyprian summed up all the arguments which he thought in favour of his cause, in a letter to Jubaianus, written in 256. Many bishops of Cilicia, Cappadocia and Phrygia, with Firmilian the learned bishop of Cæsarea, and Helenus of Tarsus at their head, fell in with the Africans, and maintained the same error.”

“ All the advocates for this practice falsely imagined it to be a point of mere discipline, in which every church might be allowed to follow its own rule or law,—not of faith, which is every where invariable. Firmilian and St Cyprian maintained the contest with too much warmth; especially the former, who spoke of St Stephen in a manner not altogether becoming. The respect which is due to their name and virtue, obliges us to cast a veil over this unjustifiable want of temperance; in imitation of the great St Augustine—who, speaking of Firmilian, says: “ I will not touch upon what he let fall in his anger against Stephen.” He was willing to persuade himself, that both Firmilian and St Cyprian afterwards renounced their prejudices. He often repeats, that their eminent labors and their charity atoned for this fault. Writing of St Cyprian, he says: “ That fault was compensated by the abundance of his charity, and was done away by the axe of his martyrdom.” (l. 1, de bapt. c. 18.)

“ Stephen,” says this father, (l. 5. c. 21.) “ thought of excommunicating them; . . . but being endued with the bowels of holy charity, he judged it better to abide in union. . . . The

peace of Christ overcame in their hearts." Let this great saint's authority suffice—in answer to the cavils and slanderous insinuations of some modern critics, who most unjustly tax the conduct of pope Stephen with haughtiness and pride."

"The judicious Vincent of Lerins (Common. c. 9.) gives the following statement of the dispute in question:—"when all (but the comparatively few that patronised it) cried out against the novelty, and the priests every where opposed it in proportion to each one's zeal, then pope Stephen of blessed memory, bishop of the apostolic see, stood up with his other colleagues against it; but he—in a signal manner above the rest—thinking it becoming, I believe, that he should go as much beyond them by the ardor of his faith, as he was raised above them by the authority of his see. In his letter to the church of Africa, he thus decrees:—*Let no innovation take place; let that be observed which is handed down to us by tradition.* The discreet and holy man was well aware, that the rule of piety admits nothing *new*; but that all things are to be delivered down to our posterity—with the same fidelity with which they were received; and that it is our duty to follow religion, and not make religion follow us: for the proper characteristic of a modest and sober christian, is—not to obtrude his own conceits upon posterity, but to make his own imaginations bend to the wisdom of those who have gone before him. What then was the issue of this grand affair? Antiquity kept possession, and novelty was exploded."

"With this great man Eusebius, (l. 7. c. 3.) St Augustine in many places, (as above) St Jerom, (dial. contr. Lucif.) Facundus Hermian, (l. 10. c. 3.) &c. unanimously aver, that St Stephen maintained the apostolical tradition, and the doctrine of the church afterwards solemnly defined by the great councils of Arles and Nice." (See the learned Alban Butler's *Lives of Saints*, vols. viii. p. 35-6, 7, 8. and ix. 208-9. ed. Edin.)

REFORMATION—so called by its sectarists, and emphatically termed by them—the *Work of Light*, and *the happiest as well as the most astonishing revolution that ever took place on the grand theatre of the world*, was effected by Luther and his fellow gossellers in the sixteenth century. The author of the *Spirit of Controversy* exhibits this extraordinary revolution in the most unfavorable point of view, and characterises it as follows:—"That monstrous aggregate of the thing called the Reformation," says he, "has been prurient of more absurdities, and even of more immorality and impiety than the Coran itself," (p. 155.) Our readers we must leave to judge—which of these two characters most appositely define the protestant reformation. (See the articles LUTHER, CALVIN, &c.)

RHETORIANS—a sect which, according to Philastrius, first

appeared in Egypt in the fourth age. They were so denominated from Rhetorius their author. They patronised all the heresies which had been broached from the infancy of the church down to that period, and maintained them all to be equally rational ! Their system would seem to coincide with that of Liberitism or Latitudinarianism, and to have little or no connection with christianity.

ROSCELIN—who taught theology towards the close of the eleventh century, maintained that the three Divine Persons constituted three different things, just as three angels constitute three distinct beings ; pretending that otherwise it might be truly said, that the Father and the Holy Ghost, as well as the Son, assumed our human nature ; but that, notwithstanding, the Father, Son and Holy Ghost were but one God ; because they had the same power and the same will. He thought, however, that they might have been termed three Gods, had not prescription declared against that manner of speaking with respect to the Divinity. This is the error of the Tritheists : it was condemned in a council held at Compiègne in 1092. Roscelin retracted ; but a short time after he gave out, that his recantation was merely the effect of a serious apprehension on his part, of being knocked on the head by an ignorant populace.

St Anselm undertook a refutation of this erroneous doctrine in a treatise entitled—*Of Faith,—of the Trinity and the Incarnation*. Throughout this treatise he insists triumphantly on the reasonableness—of *captivating our understanding* and our reason itself *to the mysteries of faith*, as St Paul admonishes ; and of not arguing against any point of doctrine taught by the church of God. He observes, that the incomprehensibility of any mystery is no reason why we should reject it ; and that it would be folly to deny that there are many things above the reach of human understanding.

RUNCARII—a sect which practised the infamies of the Patarini or Paulicians ; maintaining that no carnal sin was mortal, &c. See PATARINI.

RUPITANI, or ROCKMEN—a branch of Donatists : see the article. (Dup. 13, siec. p. 190.)

RUSTICS—a name given to a sect of Anabaptists, consisting of country clowns and banditti who, under the pretext of religion, excited tumult and insurrections in the towns. See the article ANABAPTISTS.

S

SABBATARIANS—a branch of Anabaptists. Consult the article.

SABELLIANISM—the heresy of Sabellius of Ptolemais in Libya, a disciple of Noëtus, who renewed the condemned opinions of Praxeas; denying the real distinction of the three Divine Persons. St Dionysius of Alexandria to whom belonged the care of the churches of Pentapolis, caused the authors of this error to be admonished, in order to disclaim it: but they defended their blasphemies with greater obstinacy. He therefore condemned them in a council at Alexandria in 261. Before this, by a letter of which Eusebius has preserved a fragment, he had given information of the doctrine of Sabellius to St Sixtus II. bishop of Rome from 257 to 259, (l. 7. c. 9.) In his letter to Euphranor and Ammonius against this heresy, he insists much on the proofs of Christ's human nature—to shew that the Father is not confounded with the Son. Some persons took offence at his doctrine; and complaints on this head were carried to St Dionysius bishop of Rome, who had succeeded St Sixtus. That pope wrote to the bishop of Alexandria upon the subject, who cleared himself by showing, that when he called Christ a creature and different in substance from the Father, he spoke only of his human nature. This was the subject of his apology to the bishop of Rome, in which he demonstrated that the Son, as to his divine nature, is of the same substance with the Father; as is clearly proved by St Athanasius in his book *On the Opinion of Dionysius*. In his apology Dionysius established also, against both ancient and modern heretics, the divinity of the Holy Ghost; as St Basil testifies by quotations extracted from the above apologetic. See **PRAXEANS**, **NOETIANS**, &c.

Beausobre's vindication of Sabellius, as well as of almost every other heretic, is trifling and nugatory in the extreme. Here he is deserted by his great rival in misrepresentation—Mosheim. (*Historiæ Christian. sæc. 3, n. 33.*)

SACCOPHORI—an epithet which designated various sectarians; for instance, the *Apotactics*, the *Apostolics*, the *Encratites*, *Manichees*, &c. (See their respective articles.) They were clad in sack-cloth, to give them an air of penitence and mortification; and often under this garb they concealed the most shameful irregularities. The church, aware of their hypocrisy, and that the people frequently are duped by this vain show of mortification, never hesitated on such occasions to proscribe it.

SACRAMENTARIANS—those that denied the real presence. See **ZUINGLIANS** and **CALVINISTS**.

SAMPSEANS—were Oriental sectarists whose opinions are not distinctly known. St Epiphanius, in his history of sectarism (hær. 53) says, they cannot properly be ranked with either Jews, or Christians, or Pagans; and that their system appears to have been a compound borrowed from them all. Their name is derived from the Hebrew word *Schemesch*, which signifies the sun; and they are supposed to have adored that heavenly body. On the other hand they are said, rather inconsistently, to have maintained the unity of the godhead, and to have practised the Jewish ablutions, with other ceremonies of that religion; and St Epiphanius takes them to have been the same with the Elcesaites. See that article. The adoration of the sun was very common among the Oriental nations in ancient times, and the Jews themselves were guilty of it more than once. It is condemned in scripture as a crime. Deut. c. 4, v. 19. Job c. 31, v. 26, &c. Ezech. c. 8, v. 16.

SANDEMANIANS—originated in Scotland in 1728. John Glas, a minister of the kirk of Scotland, was expelled from its communion; and his adherents formed themselves into separate societies, conformable in their rights and discipline, to what they deemed to be the plan of the first churches recorded in the New Testament. In Scotland they still retain the name of Glasites. Before the year 1760, Sandeman, an elder in one of these societies, established them in strict fellowship with the churches of Scotland; while he renounced all communion with other churches. From him the sect is ordinarily distinguished by the appellation of Sandemanians.

Their chief peculiarities in practice are—their weekly administration of the *Lord's Supper*; their love feasts, of which every member is *required* to partake, and which consist in their dining together at each other's habitations—in the interval between the morning and afternoon service; their *kiss of charity*, used on this occasion, at the admission of a new member, and at other times when deemed necessary and proper; their previous collection for the poor, and for other purposes; mutual exhortation; abstinence from blood and things strangled; washing each other's feet—the precept concerning which they understand literally;—community of goods—in this sense, that each one is to consider whatever he possesses, as liable to the calls of the poor, and of their society; and the unlawfulness of laying up treasures upon earth—by reserving them for any distant, future and uncertain use.

In their discipline they are strict and severe, and will hold no communion with other societies which appear to them not to

profess—what *they* call—the *simple truth*, or neglect to act accordingly. In a word, they may, with great propriety, rank among the Presbyterians—as the Pharisees did heretofore among the Jews. They cannot well exceed them in the opinion which they entertained of their own righteousness—although, unfortunately, our Blessed Saviour thought not quite so highly of them. (See Mr Evans, *Sketch*.)

SANGUINARIANS—a sect of Anabaptists, who deemed it a sacred duty to shed the blood of all that differed in opinion from themselves.

SATURNINUS—said to have been a disciple of Menander, improved upon his master's system, and himself became the author of a sect. His visionary fancies regarding the origin of all things, the pretended good and evil Principles, the eternity of matter and the production of this visible world, were equally arbitrary, unphilosophical and absurd. For what can be more ridiculous than to imagine two eternal, increated, self-existent Beings in lieu of one; while it would be just as rational to suppose there were ten thousand? See the articles HERMOGENIANS, MANICHEES, &c.

SECEDERS—are those in globo, who dissent from the Kirk of Scotland; and are rigid Calvinists—more austere in their manners, and severe in their discipline, than ordinary presbyterians. They derive their appellation from the Latin word *secedo*, which signifies *to withdraw*. There is a class of dissenters from the church of Scotland termed the *Relief* society; who differ from the Kirk principally, if not solely, in choosing their own ministers.

SECUNDIANS—the followers of Secundus a disciple of Valentinus, who introduced certain alterations in the system of that impostor. See VALENTINIANS. (Epiph. Hær. 32. Philastr. Hær. 40.)

SEGARELIANS or **SAGARELIANS**. See the article APOSTOLICS.

SELEUCUS—adopted the errors of HERMOGENES. See HERMOGENIANS.

SEMI-ARIANS—were those that maintained Jesus Christ to be *like* in substance, but not *consubstantial* with the Father. See ARIANS.

SEMIPELAGIANS. See PELAGIANS.

SEMIQUIETISTS. See QUIETISTS.

SETHIANS or SETHITES—were heretics of the second age who had an extraordinary veneration for the patriarch Seth, one of the sons of Adam: they were a branch of Valentinians, and pretended that two angels of very contrary dispositions had created Cain and Abel;—that after the death of Abel, the *great virtue*, by which we suppose they meant the Divine Power, raised up Seth *from seed immaculate*: but they do not inform us—whether the angels—some of whom were good, the rest evil—had derived their origin from the same source. They tell us indeed, that these good and evil spirits had concurred in the production of a wicked generation of men, whom their fanciful supreme divinity, called by them the *Great Virtue*, overwhelmed in the universal flood; but that, notwithstanding, a part of their malignity found its way into the ark, and thence diffused itself over the earth. This absurd hypothesis was devised in order to account for the existence of good and evil in the universe; and, to the same origin precisely, does the system of the various sects of Gnostics owe its birth.

Theodoret confounded the Sethians with the Ophites, and very possibly the only difference between these two sects was—the superstitious veneration of the former for the patriarch Seth: they maintained that his soul had transmigrated into the sacred person of Jesus Christ, and constituted one individual with him. They held a thousand other still greater absurdities, which it would be quite superfluous to detail. (See St Ireneus adv. Hær. l. 1. c. 7, &c. St Epiph. Hær. 31. Tert. de Prescrip. c. 47.)

SEVERIANS—a branch of Tatianites, headed by one Severus a disciple of Tatian. (See TATIANITES.)

SHAKERS—are an American sect which took its rise towards the close of the last century. They are the disciples of one Hannah Leese, “whom they stile,” says Mr Evans, “the elect lady, and the mother of all the elect; who, poor creatures! must have been without a mother during the long lapse of so many ages before her appearance in North America!” Be this as it may, we are told that she is the identical woman mentioned in the twelfth chapter of the Revelations; that she can speak seventy-two languages, and converses with the dead. Jumping, dancing, and violent exertions of the body are the favorite exercises of this athletic sect, which bringing on *shaking*, they are hence denominated *Shakers*. Dancing, they say, denotes their victory over sin. They are also much pleased with another similar religious feat: it consists in turning round and round for an hour or two successively; which, in their sublime ideas, admirably shews the great power of God. See a farther account of these fanciful enthusiasts in the Travels of Rochefoucault through America, vol. 1.

SIMON the MAGICIAN—was a Samaritan, and had acquired an extraordinary reputation in the city of Samaria, before the arrival of St Stephen. St Luke informs us, that he seduced the people with his magical practices; and he adds, (Acts viii. 10) *that they all gave ear to him from the least to the greatest, saying: This man is the power of God, which is called great.* These illusions and impostures the infernal spirit sought to oppose to the true miracles of Christ; as he was suffered to assist the magicians of Pharaoh against Moses. But God, when he permits the devil to exert in so extraordinary a manner his natural strength and powers, always furnishes his servants with the means of discerning and confounding the imposture. Accordingly, the true and undeniable miracles wrought by St Philip, put the magician out of countenance. Being himself eye-witness to these miracles, and seeing the people run to Philip to be baptised, he also, believed or pretended to believe, and was baptised. After which he attended Philip very diligently—in hopes of receiving at his hands the power of miracles, like those which he saw performed by him. The apostles at Jerusalem hearing of the conversion of Samaria, sent thither St Peter and St John to confirm the new proselytes by the imposition of hands—a sacrament which only bishops could confer. With the peculiar grace of this sacrament were usually imparted to the faithful at that time, certain external gifts of the miraculous powers. Simon seeing these communicated to the laity by the imposition of the hands of the apostles, wished to purchase of them with money a similar privilege for himself: *Give me also,* cried Simon, *this power; that on whomsoever I shall lay my hands, he may receive the Holy Ghost.* But St Peter said to him: *Keep thy money to thyself to perish with thee, because thou hast thought that the gift of God may be purchased with money. Do penance for this thy wickedness; and pray to God, if perhaps this thought of thy heart may be forgiven thee. For I see thou art in the gall of bitterness, and engaged in the bonds of iniquity.* Thus ill disposed, he was incapable of receiving the gifts of the Holy Ghost, or, at least, interior sanctifying grace. Nor did he sincerely desire this. However, fearing the threat of temporal evils, he answered: *Pray you for me to the Lord, that none of these things may come upon me.* From this crime of Simon the sin of buying or selling any spiritual thing,—a traffic which both the law of nature and the positive Divine law most severely condemn, is called *simony*; and to maintain it lawful, is usually termed in the canon law, the heresy of Simon Magus. Of this impostor we have no farther account in holy writ, except that he and his disciples seem hinted at by St Paul and St Jude; (2 Tim. iii. 1, 2, 3, 8, 13. Jude 4) and St James proves against them, as well as against our reformers of latter times, the necessity of good works in order to salvation. (ii. 14.) St Peter also draws

their portrait in the most frightful colors. (2 Pet. ii. 1, 2, 3, 13, &c.) The fathers generally deem the pretended conversion of Simon to the faith—an act of hypocrisy, founded only in ambition and temporal views, and in the hope of purchasing the gifts of the Holy Ghost, which he ascribed to a superior art magic. We learn from St Epiphanius, (Hær. 21) St Ireneus, (l. 1, c. 20) Tertullian, (Præscrip. c. 33) Theodoret (Hæret. Fab. c. 1, 5, 9,) and other fathers, that he afterwards pretended to be the Messiah, and called himself the Power of God who was descended upon earth to save mankind, and to re-establish order in the universe, which he affirmed had been disturbed by the ambition of the angels, contending for the principality, and enslaving men under their tyrannical government of this visible world. He said, that to hold man in subjection to themselves, they had invented the law of good works; whereas, *he* contended—that faith alone sufficeth to salvation. The world, he said, was created by angels who afterwards revolted from God, and usurped in it an undue power. Nevertheless he commanded them to be honored, and sacrifices to be offered to the Father by the mediation of these powers,—not with a view to implore their succour, but to appease them, for fear they should obstruct our designs, or hurt us after death. This superstitious worship of the angels was a downright idolatry, and was condemned by St Paul. (Col. ii. 18.) Simon moreover rejected the Old Testament; pretending it was framed by the angels, and that he himself was sent to abolish it. Having purchased at Tyre an abandoned female slave of great beauty, he called her Helena, and said she was the first intelligence, and that through her the Father had created the angels. He used to call himself the Holy Ghost, and sometimes honored Helena too with the name of Paraclete. To himself he required divine honors to be paid, under the character of Jupiter, and to Helena in that of Minerva. His extravagant system was a medley formed from Paganism, and the Christian, Jewish and Samaritan doctrines; and he sowed the seeds of the abominations afterwards practised by the Gnostics. In all things he affected to rival Jesus Christ; and, in imitation of his ascension into heaven, he is said at Rome to have raised himself in the air by his magical powers, in presence of the emperor. SS. Peter and Paul beholding the delusion, had recourse to prayer; upon which the impostor fell to the ground, broke a leg in the fall, and died a few days after in confusion and despair. Eusebius and other authors assure us, that the sect was not extinct till the commencement of the fifth age.

SOCINIANS—derive their appellation from Faustus Socinus a native of Sienna. His uncle Lælius Socinus, who died in 1562, had left behind him several treatises in manuscript, against the

mystery of the blessed Trinity; and many amongst his friends embraced his heterodox opinions, especially his nephew Faustus who entered warmly into his uncle's views, and resolved to commence himself—reformer of the reformed. With this design he went to Basil, and published his book *On Jesus Christ the Saviour*; in which he openly revived the Samosatene and Photinian heresy. Blandrata, an Antitrinitarian, who, after the execution of Servetus at Geneva for similar opinions, had retired into Poland and thence into Transylvania, invited him thither. Socinus afterwards passed into Poland, in 1579. The Antitrinitarians of that kingdom were already divided into about fifty different sects; but were all known by the general name of Unitarians. They had their conventicles in many great towns in Poland; but Racovia in Little Poland was their metropolis, under the protection of the lord of that city, who had renounced Calvinism to espouse the cause of Unitarianism. In this place the Antitrinitarians had a famous college; in which Crellius was the most celebrated professor, and minister from the year 1612. His name stands foremost, with the exception of Socinus himself, on the list of Socinian teachers; and his books *On the Unity of God*, and *the Satisfaction of Christ* against Grotius's answer to Socinus, are much esteemed by his own sect. The college subsisted till the year 1638, when it was suppressed—in punishment of the riots of the students, who had pulled down the public crosses in the country, and profaned the churches. Faustus Socinus lived many years in Cracow; but spent his latter days, and died in 1604, at a gentleman's house in the country, nine miles distant from that city. The Arians and Socinians of Poland favored Ragotzi, prince of Transylvania in his wars against Poland; by which they so exasperated the state, that they were banished the kingdom in 1658, being allowed only two years to dispose of their estates. Great numbers retired into Holland, though they were not permitted there the exercise of their public worship. See Christophori Sandii *Bibliotheca Antitrinitariorum*, an impious though curious and learned piece, &c. This writer in his *Nucleus Historiæ Ecclesiasticæ*, pretends to derive a continued succession of Arians and Socinians, as some protestant writers do—of protestants, from the earliest ages of christianity.

The leading principles of Socinianism are, first, that all scriptural doctrines are so to be understood, as to contain nothing above reason,—no mystery: and all the expressions which seem to imply the reverse, are to be looked upon as lofty, exaggerated phrases of the Oriental languages: for they pretend, that nothing is to be allowed in faith, which our reason does not fully comprehend. Hence it would follow—that articles of faith must vary in proportion to men's capacities. Secondly, the Socinians teach, that Christ was formed indeed, by God—an extraordinary personage; born of the Virgin Mary; taken up to heaven, and

endued with that portion of divine power and knowledge which is denominated the Holy Ghost; and sent again upon earth God's ambassador to men—to teach them his will and divine law. They deny his death to have been a satisfaction for our sins; but say, that those who obey his precepts, as all may do *by the strength of their own nature*, will rise again in other bodies, and enjoy a happy life in that blessed place, in which God possesses his own beatitude: but that the wicked shall be condemned to torments for a limited duration, after which they will be reduced to a state of annihilation. Some of them condemn, with the Quakers, all oaths, wars, and magistracies, together with all capital punishment. Their form of worship differs little from that of Calvinists—their most intolerant and hereditary enemies. With them none but adults are baptised, and that by immersion; and their notion of the eucharist is such as a Zuinglian or a Presbyterian would allow.

The first catechism of this sect was put out at Cracow in 1574. Faustus Socinus compiled a new one, which has been since enlarged under the title of the Catechism of Racovia: in it all points of the Socinian doctrine are not expressed; being intended rather as an apology to externs, than for the instruction of this people. See Schimidius's comments upon it in 1707, &c. &c.

Some Socinians maintain Christ to have had an existence by creation, before he was born of the Virgin Mary; but deny that he created the world, and interpret all passages in which creation is ascribed to him—of its spiritual creation or renovation, in as much only as he raised it from sin by his perfect law. Socinus maintained the lawfulness of worshipping and praising Christ, against one Davides and his disciples—Franken, Sommer, &c. whom he calls *Semi-Judaizantes*, and against whom he published his book *contra Semi-Judaizantes*. Yet he very inconsistently procured the imprisonment of Davides; since he allows this to be a point of no importance, and even affirms that *they* do best, who never pray to Christ at all. (*Respons. ad Wajeckum*, T. ii. p. 538.) The Budneans—so called from Simon Budneus who was followed by great numbers of Antitrinitarians in Lithuania and Polish Russia, and in 1584 was deprived of his office of teacher and preacher by Socinus and his friends, hold it unlawful to offer prayers, or worship and adoration to Christ; and were with their author by Socinus secluded from the communion of his sect. The Holy Ghost is generally reduced by them to a mere operation of the Deity.

Since the expulsion of the Socinians from Poland, they seem no where to retain a form of public church government, except in Transylvania; where it still subsists, though in some degree discountenanced. (See *Historia Crypto-Socinianismi Altorfini*.) The Calvinistic magistrates and divines rendered abortive—by

their vigilance and severity—all the efforts of the sect to sanction it in Holland. Samuel Crellius, who is esteemed the most subtle and the most learned writer of this society, chose rather to be called from Artemon—an Artemonite, than a Socinian. Many among the Arminians in Holland and Holstein, from Pelagianism fell into Socinianism. (See *Cimbriæ Literatæ*, T. 2. p. 981, &c.) When the Socinian and Arian controversies were started in Holland by the Polish refugees, they soon reached England; and many even among the Presbyterian and Independent ministers, warmly embraced their errors, as Mr Nelson informs us in his *Life of Bishop Bull*. At that time the disputes about justification had been carried on with the greatest heat—both among the dissenters and the divines of the established church; many leaning to Antinomianism and Libertinism; some to Pelagianism and Socinianism; and others adhering to the council of Dort, Manicheism and Fatalism. The Solifidians in the first class, were long the most numerous; the greater part looking upon this doctrine as the essence and the very soul of Protestantism. This error Mr George Bull of Oxford, then rector of Suddinton in Gloucestershire, solidly confuted by his *Harmonia Apostolica* printed in 1669; in which he defends, against the two grand reformers Luther and Calvin, the doctrine of St James concerning justification by works, and demonstrates that St Paul unequivocally teaches the same.

In these debates concerning justification, some fell into the Socinian error with relation to Christ's satisfaction, imported hither from Holland; and blasphemously maintained, that Christ did not suffer or die for man's redemption, or the satisfaction of sin; and that no satisfaction or atonement can be made for another by a commutation of persons. This error was indeed refuted by Dr Williams and Stillingfleet; but was an introduction to the main Socinian blasphemy, that Christ was a mere man, and had no existence before his temporal birth of the blessed Virgin; which pernicious doctrine—together with Arianism in all its forms, was rapidly diffused in England: and these heresies are now publicly professed by whole assemblies—in London and elsewhere. Many among the people called Quakers, seem to deny the mystery of the blessed Trinity; and Hicks the Anabaptist, in his famous challenge to William Penn and George Whitehead, and to the Quakers in general, and in his conference on this head in London 1674, seems clearly to prove, that George Fox himself denied the divinity of Christ. And the learned Doctor Hickes, in his letter to Mr Nelson concerning Bishop Bull, ranks Quakers among the Unitarians, that is, the Socinians and Arians. (*Life of Bull*, p. 515.) It must be owned, however, that neither George Fox the Anabaptist shoemaker, who first organised this sect in 1655, nor his fanatic colleague James Nailor, formerly quarter-master in Lambert's regiment under

Cromwell, *explicitly* denied the Trinity. Neither is this *expressed* in Robert Barclay's *Apology* for the Quakers. Yet they universally reject the words *Trinity* or *Persons* in God, and give no explanation of the scripture expressions, which alone they affect to employ. For a more detailed account of the use and progress of Antitrinitarianism see Butler's *Moveable Feasts*, p. 605—to 642; also Mr Milner's viii. *Letter to a Prebendary*, upon Hoadlyism; the works of Doctors Bull, Williams, &c.

The grand principle of Socinianism—that no *mystery* can be admitted in religion, and that what is *above* human reason is of course *repugnant* to it, flatters the pride of the human heart: but it is, in fact, the most extravagant inconsistency—in *man*, who at almost every step is compelled to own the weakness and short-sightedness of reason, and to whom the whole universe is in every part an inexplicable enigma: and much more—in a *christian*, to whom the scriptures present a religion founded on *mystery* and *revelation*. This inconsistency becomes more glaring when we take a nearer view of the doctrines of the most celebrated Socinians—differing widely from each other, and all fraught with mysteries more incomprehensible than those at which they take offence, if arrant nonsense may be allowed the name of mystery. The evidence of the Divine revelation, which by its meridian brightness dispels the mists of Deism, exposes also the artful subterfuges and studied evasions of Socinianism. The Calvinists, who rejected mysteries in the eucharist, and in several other doctrinal articles—upon the Socinian principle; and who established religion upon the pretended grounds of reason, contesting it to have been founded by Christ on authority, were often at a loss for an answer in defending the far more incomprehensible mysteries of the Trinity and Incarnation—against the Anti-Trinitarians. Unwilling, however, to set aside christianity itself by stripping it of every advantage of which it is possessed, they—by a palpable dereliction of their own principles—repressed these errors with the sword. But great numbers of them now have so far shaken off themselves the yoke of christianity, as to have adopted in many points the Socinian system. “In this,” says D'Alembert, “if they are not orthodox, they are at least consistent with their own principles.” (*Miscellaneous Pieces*, printed at Paris and at London.) See against Socinianism the concise, but most learned and accurate *Answer to Clerk and Whiston*, by Dr Hawarden, in 1729.

SOUTHCOTTIANS—are the followers of the visionary Lady Joanna Southcott, who in 1792 commenced her prophetic career,—announcing eventual salvation to the entire human race. The Lord, it would seem, told Lady Southcott, among other things, “that he should visit the surrounding nations with various ca-

lamities for fifteen years, as a warning to this land; and that then he should bring about events *here*, which should more clearly manifest the truth of her mission, by judgments and otherwise; so that this should be the happy nation to be the first redeemed from its troubles, and be the instrument for awakening the rest of the world to a sense of what is coming upon all, and for destroying *the beast*, and those who *worship his image*." (See Mr Evans, *Sketch*.)

The *truth* of this prophetess's mission, we presume, is still as far from being made manifest to the world at large, as it was the first instant she began to prophesy, notwithstanding full *twenty years* have now elapsed since that period. So that her authority, we fear, must daily be on the decline among her votaries, unless some other equally inspired female should kindly step forward and contribute to uphold the flimsy delusion. Dame Southcott, by the bye, is herself possessed of wonderful invention, and loquacious address in palliating her fanciful new dreams to the credulity of an undiscerning rabble. Her pamphlets are numerous, and constitute a curious farrago of prose and verse. Her passports to heaven, which she encloses in a small box to be carefully deposited in the coffin of the happy purchaser, she rates indeed somewhat high; though certainly, the price is by no means adequate to the intrinsic value of so precious a commodity.

Since writing the above, we are informed, the inventive genius of this very eccentric female continues to amuse the public with wonderful accounts of new revelations, among which the most important is—that she is actually with child of the Messiah, who, she says, is now about to re-visit the world through her medium *in the flesh*, and to commence his millennial reign with all the elect upon the new apocalyptic earth. She had before, we recollect, given some shrewdish hints to mortals what was in contemplation—when she revealed to the happy individual whom she was to marry, the nature of the functions to be discharged by him in quality of husband. Her miraculous conception closely followed the delicate intimation; and, admirable indeed, is the pious officiousness with which her female votaries provide—the requisite *staté* appendages for the honorable reception of the new-born king of Israel;—among other precious articles,—a cradle of the most costly materials and unrivalled workmanship, and a font of massy silver gilt. Dame Southcott will now be in a capacity to dispute the pre-eminence in the new millennial kingdom, even with her very ambitious American rival Hannah Leese—the reputed *Mother of all the elect*. (See article SHAKERS.)

STADHINGI—were fanatics of the diocese of Bremen who adopted the Manichean principles, and in their assemblies worshipped Lucifer and the devil; on which occasions the most in-

famous excesses were deemed acts of piety. The sect gradually increased, and missionaries were sent among them; whom the Stadhingi, with many insults, put to death. They conceived it would be a sacrifice singularly grateful to their good Principle Lucifer, if they could but immolate to him all the priests of Christendom. They roamed up and down the country; pillaging the churches, and massacring the ministers of religion. Their progress alarmed the pastors of the church; and pope Gregory IX. published against them a crusade, according the same indulgences to those that undertook it, as to the crusards in the holy wars of Palestine. Multitudes soon offered themselves for the sacred expedition, and were headed by the bishop of Bremen, the Duke of Brabant, and the Count of Holland. The Stadhingi trained to military discipline and led on by their frantic author who was himself a soldier, encountered their assailants with determined courage, left above six thousand of their fellows on the field of battle; and the sect itself was totally destroyed. (D'Argentré, Collect. Jud. tom. 1. an. 1230. Nat. Alex. in sæc. 13. Dupin, treizieme siecle, c. 19.) See the articles MANICHEES, ALBIGENSES, &c.

SWEDENBORGIANS, or NEW JERUSALEMITES—are the followers of Emanuel Swedenborg, a Swedish nobleman, who died in London, 1772. This very fanciful gentleman conceived himself to be the founder (under the Lord) of the *New Jerusalem church*, described in the apocalypse. He, like every other enthusiast, supports his novel opinions with scriptural authority. In the year 1743, the Lord, forsooth, manifested himself to him by a personal appearance, and opened his *spiritual* eyes constantly to see and converse with *spirits* and angels. Of the marvellous things heard and seen by him he gives the following account in his treatise concerning *heaven and hell*: “As often as I conversed with angels face to face, it was in their habitations which are like to our houses on earth, but far more beautiful and magnificent, having rooms, chambers and apartments in great variety; as also spacious courts belonging to them, together with the gardens, parterres of flowers, fields, &c. where the angels are formed into societies. They dwell in contiguous mansions, disposed—after the manner of our cities—in streets, walks and squares. I have had the privilege to walk through them, to examine all round about me, and to enter into their houses; and this when I was fully awake, having my inward eyes opened.” A similar description he gives of heaven itself.

Among other strange dreams, *with his spiritual eyes open*, he recounts the grand event of the last judgment, which took place, he says, in the *spiritual* world in 1757. From this era is dated the second coming of the Lord, and the commencement of a

new christian church, which is meant, they tell us, by the new heaven and new earth in the Revelations, and the New Jerusalem thence descending.

Every page of scripture, according to our Swedish instructor, is written by certain correspondences, that is, by such things in the natural world as correspond unto and signify—things in the spiritual world. The science of correspondences, it is said, had been lost for some thousands of years, namely, ever since the time of Job; till it was renewed by Emanuel Swedenborg, who uses it as a key to the spiritual or internal sense of holy writ. This may suffice to give some idea of the *spirituality* of his own conceptions, and those of his deluded followers, who are pretty numerous in various parts of this kingdom, in Germany, Sweden, North America, &c. See Mr Evans's Sketch. A Trinity of Persons in the Godhead is rejected by this sect, while they maintain an ideal kind of Trinity in Jesus Christ. They are very partial to vocal music accompanied by the organ; and the minister's dress is now exactly similar to that of the English clergy. Ibid.

SYNCRETISTS—a sect of Lutherans. See that article.

SYNERGISTS—another Lutheran sect. See Luther.

T

The TACITURN or SILENT—were a sect of Anabaptists. See their article.

TANKELIN or TANCHELIN—though a layman, commenced preacher at the beginning of the twelfth age, and published a variety of erroneous doctrines;—doctrines which had been gradually diffusing over France for near a century of the profoundest ignorance, ushered in originally by the incursions of barbarians,—against the Roman pontiff, against the sacraments, and against the government of prelates, &c. He declaimed incessantly upon these topics, and taught the people the sacred duty of despising their superiors. The sacraments, he pretended, were sacrilegious ceremonies; the churches—houses of prostitution. As for the eucharist, he looked upon it as absolutely useless; and he prohibited the paying of tithes. The ignorant and besotted people eagerly imbibed his notions, and thought him a divine man commissioned by heaven to reform the church. An armed multitude escorted him in triumph to the pulpit; and while he

preached—a standard and a sword were displayed in order to enforce attention. His words were received by the gaping croud with the veneration due to oracles.

When he had thus gained the ascendant over a deluded rabble, he blasphemously pretended, that he himself was God, and in nothing inferior to Jesus Christ. He said, that Jesus was God only in as much as he had received the Holy Ghost; and that himself had equally received the plenitude of the same divine spirit, and consequently was his equal. He was believed; and to such a pitch of folly did the delusion proceed, that the stupid people applauded the impostor—for the most unblushing effrontery with which he publicly abused their wives and daughters; esteeming it a mighty honor to be thus dishonored by the vilest of all hypocrites. The wretch now proceeded at the head of his frantic sectaries, to fill with slaughter and dismay all places where his impious doctrines were not submissively embraced; till at length he fell a sacrifice to the tumults which himself had raised. His sect was propagated in the vicinity of Cologne and Utrecht; but was soon suppressed by the severity of their punishment, except a remnant which intermingled with those groups of other heretics that then attacked the sacraments, the ceremonies of the church, and churchmen. (D'Argentré Collect. Judicior. t. 1, p. 11.)

TASCADRUGISTS—the same with *Passalorynchites*: see the article MONTANISTS.

TATIAN—was a Syrian, a platonic philosopher, and disciple of St Justin the martyr; after whose death he taught some time at Rome. Returning into Syria in 171, he there disseminated his erroneous opinions, which he had dissembled while at Rome. Several of these errors he had borrowed from Marcion, Valentinus and Saturninus (see their respective articles); holding, like them, two self-existing Principles, and that the Creator is the evil God. To these capital errors he added several others; for instance,—that Adam was damned, &c. Marriage he condemned as not less criminal than adultery; whence his followers were called Encratites or—the Continent. They were likewise called Hydroparastatæ or Aquarii, because in consecrating their eucharist they used only water; for they absolutely condemned the use of wine, as well as that of flesh meat. (St Epiph. hæc. 46. St Iren, l. 1, c. 31. Clem. Alex. Strom. l. 3, p. 465.) Tatian's discourse against the Gentiles, in which he approves marriage, was written before his fall. In this work he maintains also—One God the Creator of all things. His fall was the consequence of pride, which but too often attends the opinion of knowledge; and of this there cannot be a more dangerous symptom in a scholar, than a love of novelty and singularity, especially when

joined with obstinacy and opiniativeness. See Mr Butler's seventh and twelfth vols. of the Lives of Saints, p. 382-3 and 108-9.

The Tatianites were numerous at Antioch, in Cilicia, Pisdia, and several provinces of Asia Minor. They had votaries even in Rome itself, in France, Aquitain and Spain.

THEOBUTUS—After the death of St James, surnamed the Just, this man expected to have succeeded him; but being disappointed in his ambitious views, he renounced christianity with the design of forming a new sect by the combination of the various systems of Jewish sectarists. We know nothing more of this ancient innovator, than that his unhallowed lust of preferment thus caused him to apostatize.

THEODOTUS OF BYZANTIUM—by trade a tanner, having apostatized from the faith to save his life in time of persecution, afterwards, to palliate the crime, pretended he had denied only a man, not God; maintaining Christ to be nothing more than a mere man, as Socinians teach at the present day: whereas, the Arians allowed him to have existed before this visible creation; though himself, notwithstanding, a creature. Theodotus going to Rome, drew many into his blasphemous opinions; for he was a man of parts and erudition. Pope Victor, to check the progress of his heresy, excommunicated his person, together with Ebion, Artemon, and another Theodotus who had upheld the same blasphemy. (St Epiph. hæ. 54. Eus. l. 5, c. 28. Conc. T. 1. Theodoret, Hæret. Fabul. l. 2, c. 5.) This other Theodotus, called *Trapezita*, or the Banker, was author of the Melchisedecian heresy. (See that article.)

The Theodotians, with our modern Socinians, contend, that the doctrine of Theodotus was maintained by the apostles themselves, and that the contrary doctrine was unknown in the church till Zephirinus found means to corrupt the ancient faith, by introducing the belief of Christ's divinity. The catholics refuted their pretensions by the testimony of the scriptures, by the hymns and canticles in use with christians from the infancy of the church; by the writings of ecclesiastical authors, namely, St Justin, Miltiades, Ireneus, Clement of Alexandria, Melito, &c. who all had taught and defended the Divinity of Jesus Christ, &c. (Theodoret, Hær. Fab. l. 2, c. 2. Euseb. Hist. Eccles. l. 4, c. 28.) The Theodotians, by an infidelity very common with the broachers of new doctrines, impiously retrenched from holy scripture whatever would not bear an interpretation favorable to their system. "Some of them, to save themselves the trouble of corrupting the sacred writings, rejected at once both the law and the prophets, under the very specious pretext, that the grace of the gospel was all-sufficient."

(Caius apud Euseb. Hist. Eccles. l. 4, c. 18.) The followers of Theodotus were not very numerous; and the sect itself was soon extinct; while the faithful increased in numbers beyond all calculation, even in the midst of persecution and continual alarms: a fact which, in the estimation of all unbiassed judges, will furnish an additional argument in favor of the primitive and catholic belief. See ANTI-TRINITARIANS, ARIANS, &c. under which articles the Divinity of the Son of God is more fully vindicated.

THEOPHILANTHROPISTS—a sect which commenced during the late awful revolution in France. It had for one of its first patriarchs and warm promoters the celebrated Thomas Paine. They reduce religion to what they call its primitive simplicity, and confine it to the belief of a Divine Being; the immortality of the soul; the supposed original form of worship insinuated by natural religion, and prescribed to the first inhabitants of the earth; and moral virtue, which they make to consist principally in doing good to their kind, and in promoting the interests and the welfare of their country. They have temples with an altar in the middle whereon they place their offerings—of flowers or of fruit, in their due season; as testimonies of their gratitude to the Author of nature. Each temple, moreover, has a tribune whence the audience is occasionally harangued; and these make up the whole of their religious ornaments. The sect is now nearly extinct. See the article **DEISTS**, of which Theophilanthropism seems to be a kind of modification; as they both concur in rejecting revelation, and devising a religious system that has no connection with christianity, nor any evidence of facts to recommend it to its followers.

TURLUPINS—were fanatics of the fourteenth century, who in addition to the errors of the Beguardæ, of whom indeed, they formed a branch, practised with unblushing publicity the infamous irregularities of the Cynics. These wretches were excommunicated by Gregory XI. and punished with great severity by christian sovereigns; which, together with the horror excited by their execrable conduct, quickly annihilated this hateful sect. Prateol. Elenchus Hæres. Bernard de Lutzebourg, Guguin. Hist. l. 9.

V

VALDENSES OR WALDENSES—were so called from Peter Valdo a merchant of Lyons, who, sensibly affected at the sudden death

of a person actually in conversation with him, distributed his effects among the poor, and determined to imitate the apostles in the future method of his life. He was joined by several others; and they were called "The poor men of Lyons." Soon after, they began to preach and teach by their own private authority, in imitation too, they said, of the apostles,—although they were but mere laymen, and destitute of missionary powers. The clergy reproved them for this irregularity, and for affecting superstitiously to wear a kind of sandals—so contrived as to exhibit the bare foot to public view; alleging, forsooth, that the apostles went thus shod. The pope enjoined them silence. Wanting however, the humility to submit, and finding that the pontiff to whom some of them applied for the approbation of their institute, rejected it as irregular and in some instances, superstitious, they said that the clergy were jealous of their superior sanctity and the purity of their morals. Nor was it long before they added heresy to their fanaticism and insubordination. Accordingly pope Lucius III. issued out against them a sentence of excommunication.

Rainerius, who from a minister of the Waldenses, became a convert to the catholic faith, and a Dominican friar in 1250, acquaints us that, among other errors, they affirmed, with some of our modern reformers, although upon different grounds, that the church of Christ had failed ever since the times of Pope Sylvester—by possessing temporalities; that it is unlawful for the clergy to have prebends or estates; that they ought to apply themselves, as the apostles did, to manual labour; that neither rents nor tythes ought to be paid to them, nor any thing bequeathed to churches: that all bishops were murderers, because they tolerated wars: that in no case is it lawful to swear; and that a man should rather choose to die than take an oath—even in a court of judicature, or in any necessity whatever. All ecclesiastic judgments they absolutely reprobated, including in this censure all judges and princes—upon the maxim, that it is never lawful to punish malefactors, or to put any man to death. They denied purgatory, and rejected prayer for the dead, indulgences, the celebration of all festivals whatever, even that of Easter; also the invocation of saints and veneration of images, crosses or relics. They maintained, that neither absolution nor any other sacrament is valid—when administered by a bad priest; but that any good *laic* has power to remit sins, and to confer the Holy Ghost by the imposition of hands. The exorcisms, benedictions and sureties in baptism, they set aside, and held that the washing of infants in that sacrament, did not avail them. With regard to the most blessed eucharist, they said that priests in mortal sin cannot consecrate, and that transubstantiation is not effected in the hands of him who consecrates unworthily, but in the mouth of him who worthily re-

ceives. They rejected also the canon of the mass, reciting in the vulgar tongue only the words of consecration, &c.

The Waldenses had subsisted chiefly in certain valleys of Piedmont, till in 1530, Œcolampadius and the Sacramentarians of Switzerland offered them terms of accommodation, but without effect. Six years after this, Farel and other Calvinistic ministers, by representing to them that their temporal security required it, prevailed with them to purchase the desired union by the relinquishment of several errors which that sect had hitherto maintained, and to acknowledge that a christian might sometimes lawfully swear before a magistrate; also, that the ministers of the altar might possess temporal estates; and that even wicked priests validly confer the sacraments. They likewise engaged them to maintain in contradiction to their former belief, that the body of Christ is not in the eucharist, and that it is not necessary to confess our sins. Most of the Waldenses, notwithstanding, adhered to their own principles—till in 1630 they were compelled, for protection, to receive among them Calvinistic teachers. (See Bossuet, *Hist. Variat.* l. 11. De Marca's *History of Bearn*. Fleury, l. 73, n. 12. F. Fontenai, in the 9th, 10th, and 11th tomes of the *Continuation of F. Languet's Church History of France*; and the late *History of Languedoc*.)

We have refuted the errors of the Waldenses under the articles VIGILANTIUS, DONATISTS, ICONOCLASTS; to which we beg leave to refer our readers. The peculiar error of this sect, which consisted in denying to the church the lawful possession of temporalities, merits not a serious discussion. Nevertheless, we will just beg leave to trespass a few moments upon the attention of our readers, and make some obvious remarks upon this subject.

According to the principles of natural equity every public functionary, of whatever description may be the functions with which he is entrusted, has a right to his subsistence; such ever was, and is at this day, the universal maxim prevalent in all nations, and established in the legislature of every commonwealth. Consequently, the revenues assigned by the church and state for the support of the clergy, are not of the nature of a gratuitous contribution, or merely an alms: they are a salary; a retribution; an honorary stipend for services to which they are in rigorous justice and strict equity obliged. Now every obligation of justice being reciprocal, *it is difficult to conceive*—how the public should be exempt from that of providing for the maintenance of those who serve it: it is on both sides a duty of *justice*, and not of *charity*: and however the mode of securing a competent revenue to ecclesiastics may vary according to circumstances,—whether it be raised by tithe or from funds legally established for the purpose, or otherwise, is immaterial: this does not in the

smallest degree affect their natural and unalienable right. On this point as on every other regulation of discipline, regard is had to the particular exigences of the times, the vicissitudes of the state, or the wants or inconveniences of the community. In vain is it objected—that Jesus Christ commanded his apostles to exercise their ministry *gratis*: he gives them at the same time a right to their subsistence. To *sell* what is spiritual or to exact for it any thing temporal as its *price*, is profanation; it is the crime of simony: but an honorable maintenance, retribution or salary accorded to a person occupied in the discharge of any function, is neither the price nor the equivalent of this function: the price is relative to the value of a thing; whereas an honorary stipendium is attached to the place which a person fills, and to the person of the functionary: it is the same for all that exercise the function, however unequal may be their personal merit, their talents or their services. A physician cannot with propriety be said to traffic in *health*, nor a magistrate to trade in *justice*; although such notions are but too common with the vulgar, and with men of little sense. Their stupidity, very fortunately for these respectable departments of the commonwealth, cannot affect the essence of the thing. (Bergier Dictionaire Theolog.)

The Waldenses in adopting the religious tenets, adopted also the turbulent and seditious spirit of their new teachers. Whenever they conceived the interests of their sect required it, they rose in arms against their lawful sovereigns, and often stained their hands in the blood of those who charitably wished to undeceive them. We do not advocate what is termed religious persecution. The inhuman principle is equally foreign to the doctrines and to the civil well-being of catholics. But we are free to say, that if, under the pretence of piety and religion—insurrection and rebellion be countenanced, superiors do right in severely punishing and vigorously repressing the upholders of tenets so notoriously destructive of the public peace. If the Waldenses could be proved to have been guiltless of the charges alleged against them, their sufferings must be ascribed to the malice of the actors, however dignified in church or state—not to the pretended intolerance of that religion which has ever been averse from bloodshed. But the calumnies of its adversaries and the wilful misrepresentations of many protestant writers, are in no instance more strikingly recognisable to persons of any reading or sincerity, than on this topic. They descant incessantly upon popish massacres, imaginary persecutions of the church of Rome, and the bloody reign of Queen Mary: but they forget the outrageous insults and provocations, the traitorous disloyalty and violent conduct of the party which became the object of persecution. The Gunpowder Plot in which a few miscreants of desperate fortunes and abandoned morals, unconnected with the catholic body, and execrated for the attempt by every individual

catholic subject in Great Britain, were unfortunately engaged,—must be for ever objected by the ignorance or the malice of controversial authors; or rather of the collective bigotry of the nation at large; as an eternal infamy to the religion of our ancestors; while the more successful, but not less nefarious plot of the very same description, planned and conducted solely by Scotch reformers, and by many of their leading characters, with every circumstance that could possibly conduce to make the crime most awfully flagitious, is hushed into oblivion, and sanctified by the holy zealotism of its perpetrators. The relentless tyranny of Queen Elizabeth in persecuting her unoffending catholic subjects merely for religion, is hardly ever noticed by our English historians. But these partial writers will not suffer their readers to be ignorant of the tyrannical cruelty of the Duke of Alva—equally reprobated by catholics and protestants—though they are careful not to mention the re-iterated conspiracies of the reformed to take away his life; or the still greater cruelties practised upon catholics by the two more infamous ruffians Vandermerk and Sonoi, both of them lieutenants to the Prince of Orange. “A celebrated biographer (Feller, Hist. Abreg. tom. 1, art. Toledo) says, that Vandermerk slaughtered more inoffensive catholic priests and peasants in the year 1572, than Alva executed protestants during the whole term of his sanguinary government. He gives us in the same place a copious extract from l’Abregé de l’Hist. del’Holland, par Mons. Kerroux, in which this protestant author, who professes to write from judicial records still extant, draws a most frightful picture of the infernal barbarities of Sonoi on the catholic peasantry of North Holland. He says; that some of these, after undergoing the torment of scourges and the rack, were enveloped in sheets of linen, steeped in spirits of wine, which being inflamed, the poor creatures were miserably scorched to death; that others, after being tortured with burning sulphur and torches applied to the tenderest parts of their bodies, were caused to die for want of sleep, guards being placed over them to beat and torment them with clubs and other weapons—whenver exhausted nature seemed to sink into forgetfulness:—that many were fed with nothing but salt herrings—without a drop of water or other liquid—until they expired with thirst; finally, that others were stung to death by wasps, or devoured alive by rats, confined in coffins with them for that inhuman purpose. Among the cruelties there recounted, some will not bear repeating, and those just mentioned are adduced with the intent only, of forcing our much prejudiced opponents to join with us in consigning the odious names of such as Alva, Vandermerk and Sonoi, to merited execration, or rather, if possible, to absolute oblivion.” See Milner’s 4th *Letter to Dr S. on Persecution.*

VALENTINUS—a Platonic philosopher, had embraced christianity; but being puffed up with the vain opinion of his own learning and superior merit, and seeing another preferred to a certain bishopric before him, revived the errors of Simon Magus, and adopted many other absurd fictions concerning the progeny of thirty æones or ages—an imaginary kind of inferior deities which this heretic pretended to have been produced by the eternal, invisible and incomprehensible God called *Βαθος* or Depth, and his wife *Εννοια* or Thought, otherwise named *Σιγη* or Silence. These chimeras he had borrowed from Hesiod's book of the genealogy of the heathen Gods, and some Platonic notions, blended with certain truths from the gospel of St John. His whimsical dreams St Ireneus refutes by scriptural authority; by the apostles' creed, of which he mentions almost all the articles; and by the unanimity of all churches in the profession of the same faith, contrasted with the perpetual disagreement of the sectaries among themselves: for there was not a disciple of Valentinus, who did not undertake to alter and reform his master's doctrine. Several of their variations he mentions, and describes at length the superstitions and impostures of the heresiarch Mark, who in consecrating chalices filled with water and wine according to the Christian rite, made the chalices appear full of a certain red liquor which he called blood, and allowed *women* to consecrate the holy mysteries. Heretics, he says, have nothing but the novelty of their doctrine to recommend them: for the Valentinians were not before Valentinus, nor the Marcionites before Marcion, &c. All these arose much too late to be the teachers of the truth. "Their novelty alone, continues he, suffices to confound them." How much more forcibly will this apply against all modern sectarists.

Valentinus first broached his heresy in Cyprus, and afterwards propagated it in Italy and Gaul. He was excommunicated by the holy pope St Pius I. (St Epiph. hæ. 41. Tertull. l. contr. Valent. Iren. Ogdoad, &c.)

VALESIANS—the deluded followers of one Valesius. This man, more zealous than discreet, in order to avoid temptation made himself an eunuch; in which action he was imitated by many others of similar dispositions with himself. These enthusiasts deemed all those to be in the way of perdition and enslaved to vice, who were not yet disposed to follow their example. They were excommunicated, and retired into a province of Arabia.

As the gospel directs all christians to study to procure the salvation of their neighbour, the Valesians conceived that this obligation could not be more effectually complied with, than by reducing other people when they had it in their power, to the same state in which they were themselves; and in case their exhorta-

tions had not the desired effect, they thought it a sacred duty of charity to offer violence to their delicacy, and to do for them by compulsion what they had not resolution enough to have done by choice; esteeming them as sick persons who in their delirium reject the remedies essential to their cure. Hence they did not fail to perform the operation indiscriminately upon all that came within the precincts of their district; and nothing was so terrifying to travellers as the idea of falling in with these religious ruffians. This circumstance may account for what St Epiphanius remarks concerning them; that they were much talked of, but little known. (Hær. 56.) It was on their account that the council of Nice decreed in its ninth canon, that those shall not be admitted among the clergy who mutilate themselves. (Conc. Nicæn. Collect. Conc. Hist. du Conc. de Nicée in oct. un. vol.) In these fanatics we may behold another early example among so many striking instances of a similar nature,—of the fallacy of the protestant maxim—that scripture interpreted by private sense is the only rule of faith!

VIGILANTIUS—a priest of Barcelona, who depreciated the merit of virginity, and condemned the veneration of relics—calling those who paid it idolaters and Cinerarians—or worshippers of ashes. St Jerom undertook the refutation of so foul a charge, and said: “We do not adore the relics of the martyrs . . . but we honor them, and adore Him whose martyrs they are. We honor the servants, that the respect which is rendered unto them may be reflected back upon the Lord.” Having obtained a copy of Vigilantius’s performance, he lost no time in answering his exceptions; shewing first, the excellency of virginity and clerical celibacy, from the discipline observed in the three patriarchates of Antioch, Alexandria and Rome. He then proceeds to vindicate the honor paid to martyrs from the imputation of idolatry, by observing, that no christian ever worshipped them as gods. In order to show that the saints in heaven pray for us, St Jerom argues thus: “If the apostles and martyrs still living upon earth could pray for other men, how much more effectually may they do it after their victories? Have they less power now they are with Jesus Christ?” St Jerom lays much stress on the miracles wrought at their tombs; though Vigilantius, admitting the notoriety of the fact, pretended they were wrought for the sake of the infidels. This supposition, in the opinion of St Jerom, would not disprove the power of the martyrs, by whose intercession they were obtained. He mentions that the bishops of Rome were accustomed to offer sacrifices to God over the venerable bones of SS Peter and Paul, and made altars of their tombs. He tells his adversary, that if his new doctrine were true, all the bishops of the world, who follow it, must be, forsooth, in error! Nor will the silly objec-

tion of many protestants be found to have any weight in the scales of sound theology. They ask with an air of triumph,—how the saints in heaven can hear at such a distance the silent whispers of their votaries? When these wise critics shall first have answered the following question:—what precisely is the distance beyond which the saints and angels cannot hear each other? Catholics may reply, that distance has nothing to do with intellectual language, such as, we presume, the inhabitants of the upper world perfectly understand. If this fall short of satisfying their curiosity, we will then acknowledge that we don't exactly know—in what manner our thoughts or fervent desires are communicated to the happy ones above; but have faith enough to believe St John, who expressly asserts in his Revelations (c. 5) that the twenty-four ancients falling down before the throne of God, offer up to him the prayers of the saints;—faith and simplicity enough to listen to the church which Christ himself has commanded all to hear, (Matt. 16) when it decides that it is lawful to invoke the saints and angels, and that they intercede for those who piously invoke them. But our adversaries still insist, that Christ alone is our mediator. Christ, most certainly, is our only mediator of redemption, not our only mediator of intercession; else what did the apostle St Paul mean in recommending himself so earnestly to the prayers of those to whom he wrote? It is in fact a doctrine insinuated in numberless passages of both the Old and New Testament; plainly taught and practised by all christian antiquity; authorised by the reiterated decisions of ecumenical councils, and defended by all the most illustrious fathers and doctors of the church. Where then is the pretended idolatry or absurdity of this catholic and venerably ancient practice? Many of the most distinguished prelates, and the best informed writers in the ranks of protestantism, have generously vindicated catholics from the groundless charge of idolatry. Such, for instance, were—Bishop Montague, (*On the Invocation of Saints*); Parker (*Disc. for the Abrogation of the Test*); Thorndike (*Just Weights and Measures*), &c. The last mentioned protestant theologian says: “Let not those who charge the pope to be antichrist, and the papists idolaters, lead the people by the nose to believe, that they can prove their supposition—when they cannot.” Numerous, however, and—unfortunately for the innocent sufferers—high in political as well as in ecclesiastic influence, is this unfeeling class of calumniators, and mischievous beyond calculation to the community at large—in a civil not less than religious view. It is not our intention to specify the numberless inconveniences resulting in this two-fold light from their slanderous aspersions. We will only beg leave to express our fervent hopes of a speedy revolution in the sentiments of our protestant brethren, as fellow-men and fellow-christians.

Vigilantius, and with him, all protestants in general, are equally displeased at the religious honor, which catholics think due to the mortal remains of deceased saints. It is a maxim engrafted in our very nature, and most congenial with true sentiments of religion. Did not Moses, impressed with these sentiments, carry with him out of Egypt the bones of the patriarch Joseph? That respect which the pious king Josias testified for the bodies of the prophets, and the miracles which Holy Scripture assures us were performed by the touch of the sacred bones of Eliseus, and the garments of St Paul, ought abundantly to justify the veneration of catholics for the relics of the saints. It was universally established throughout the whole christian church—when Vigilantius thought proper to arraign it; as St Jerom expressly informs us. Doubtless there may exist abuses in the manner, or in the measure, of this otherwise legitimate veneration; and, very possibly, these might be greater previously to the reformation than at present. But such abuses were never sanctioned by the church, and therefore could not—with the smallest plausibility—be alleged as a lawful subject of separation from her communion. M. Basnage and other cavillers of the same description, always rest their plea upon a supposition notoriously false; namely, that the catholics render to the saints and to their relics—a species of religious worship similar to that which is due to God alone. Nothing can be more disingenuous, more uncandid, or more remote from truth. We honor God with supreme and sovereign honor; the saints and angels, with an inferior and subordinate respect—different from the former, as is that which is finite from infinitude;—as that which is essentially dependent, from what is self-sufficient and absolutely independent. We apply indeed, through the poverty of our language, the same phrases in a sense widely different—without the danger of being misunderstood by any but by those who are totally unacquainted with our doctrines: and do not protestants themselves teach their children to ask their father's blessing upon their bended knees, in the same words precisely which they address to Almighty God—*Father bless me, God bless me*, without incurring the peril of idolatry?

Another point at issue between Vigilantius and St Jerom, was the celibacy of churchmen. With Vigilantius, the church of England and protestants in general declare against it. "It is," as Dr Hawarden rightly observes, "a matter of mere discipline only: and though by no means a sufficient plea for any to forsake the catholic communion;—yet if all other controversies were compromised between us, there is every reason to believe, that the church would condescend to wave such points of mere discipline, as still might be a bar to a reconciliation so much to be desired by all good and unbiassed christians. The clergy, without trespassing upon faith, might be allowed to marry; the

laity to receive the chalice and to have all the liturgy of the church in English. The *intemperance* of churchmen, although it was not the first pretence, was probably one of the first causes of the reformation. And had it been as easy to keep religious vows, as it was to break them, there would have been no more different religions in England at present, than there were three hundred years ago. But when monks took wives and nunneries were set open, the fact, of course, was to be justified; and He or She that found celibacy a restraint, was happy to throw over broken vows the hallowed veil of matrimony.

Conjugium vocat: hoc prætexit nomine culpam.

Here conscience was to be taught a new lesson: sacrilege must be made a virtue, and continence, if not a downright sin, at least a dangerous imperfection. The old religion was too old to be good; and presently it had a thousand faults. Thus the schism began; and though it be not yet three hundred years of age, the circumstance is hardly known to one-ninth part of the nation at large; and every new religion is pretended to be as old as Christ. But—more immediately to our present purpose—

“It is undoubtedly the doctrine of St Paul (1 Cor. vii.) that a single life is of itself a more perfect state, and more becoming the clergy, than that of matrimony. *He that is without a wife, is solicitous for the things that belong to the Lord, how he may please God. But he that is with a wife, is solicitous for the things of the world, how he may please his wife.* The same difference he makes between a wife and one in the state of virginity. Whence he concludes: *He that giveth his virgin in marriage doeth well; but he that giveth her not doeth better.* In effect, if the laity are advised by St Paul to abstain, at least for a while, from the rights of matrimony, *that you may give yourselves, saith he, to fasting and praying;* is it not very suitable with the office of celebrating daily the holy mysteries of our divine religion, and offering up prayers for themselves and the people, to think of no other nuptials but those of the Lamb? It is the argument of St Epiphanius (Hær. 59), of St Jerom (l. cont. Jovin. c. 19), of St Augustine (Tr. 9, in Joan.) &c.”

“To this we may add the authority of the church in the case of Jovinian, whom St Jerom calls the *Christian Epicure*. His opinion was, that there is no more merit in a single life, than in conjugal chastity. He urged the same texts of scripture which are commonly alleged against the obligation of religious vows, and the celibacy of priests. The reformation might have commenced here, had it not then been a plant out of season: like a winter flower, it was presently blasted. Jovinian was excommunicated; and his heresy was condemned by a council at Rome under pope Siricius, and by St Ambrose in a council at Milan; and it was

refuted by the writings of the last mentioned holy prelate, St Jerom and St Augustine. (S. Aug. l. de Hær. c. 82. S. Amb. Epist. 6, 7, 25. ed Par. 1603 & l. de Virg. S. Hier. lib. duob. cont. Jovin. S. Aug. l. de Bono Conjugal. & de Sanctâ Virginit.) And because Jovinian seduced ignorant virgins by saying—Are you better than Abraham, Sarah, &c.? St Augustine bade them answer, I am not better than Abraham; but the chastity of a single life is better than the chastity of marriage; and better, as he says, *in order to the kingdom of heaven*,” (l. de Bon. Conj. c. 28. & de Sanctâ Virginit. c. 14, 23.)

“ Nor was it ever the practice either of the Latin or the Greek church, for bishops or priests to marry after their ordination; notwithstanding the mistakes of some few writers asserting the contrary. They were all *under age*, says Dr Hawarden, and therefore *illegal* witnesses of what passed in the *primitive* times; and they do not affirm it of their own. Socrates indeed, says, that the holy bishop Paphnutius dissuaded the council of Nice from obliging bishops, priests and deacons (Sozomen adds—sub-deacons) to live separate from their wives, though previously engaged in wedlock. For at that time priests and bishops were ordained in some measure by compulsion; and in such case it certainly would have been rather hard, as well for themselves as for their wives, to be tied to perpetual continency. Both these cases had so much difficulty attending them, that the council was equally to be commended for its zeal in promoting clerical perfection, and for superseding the decree at that time—upon the just remonstrance of St Paphnutius. But now—when none are compelled to be either bishops or priests, or to enter among the clergy at all; and such only are ordained as are esteemed virtuous, and are willing to follow the advice of St Paul (1 Cor. vii. 7.)—of living as he did in perpetual celibacy, why may not the church be allowed to prefer them before all others; and as long as there is no want of more, promote them exclusively?—Besides, if Socrates may be credited, the above advice which the council followed, had this limitation, that *such as entered among the clergy unmarried, should always remain single, according to the ancient tradition of the church.*”

“ Moreover, the breach of religious vows is evidently in despite both of reason and the Word of God. A vow is a religious promise made to God—of a greater good; that is, of something which is better to be done than left undone. Now if it be against reason to break our faith with man, how much more so with Almighty God? *When thou shalt vow a vow unto the Lord thy God, thou shalt not slack to pay it. For the Lord thy God will surely require it of thee; and it would be sin in thee not to comply.* (Deut. xxiii. v. 21, &c.) *Better is it that thou shouldst not vow, than thou shouldst vow and not pay.* (Eccles. v. v. 4.) Hence St Augustine (l. de Bono Viduit.) says: “ I am not afraid to as-

sert, that falling from chastity vowed to God, is worse than adultery. For if it be a sin, as most certainly it is, for a woman that is a member of Christ, not to be true to her husband; how much more is Christ offended, when the promise is not kept to Himself? In effect, although God did not require the promise, he strictly requires the performance. For when a counsel, not a precept, is the matter of a vow, if it be not performed, the iniquity is greater in proportion as the necessity of making the vow was less." What then would this great saint have thought of the *reformation*, built as it is, upon the ruins of above ten thousand broken vows?"

"St Paul, indeed, gives directions—how a bishop ought to govern his *children*, (1 Tim. iii. v. 4.) For bishops in the primitive church were often widowers. But, for the government of the wife, he has left none; and if he had, it would be little to our present purpose. For in the times of the apostles both bishops and priests who had wives, lived as if they had none. Not that it was absolutely commanded either by Christ or his apostles; but because it was more becoming their sacred office; and the apostles themselves first set them the example, "who," St Jerom assures us (ep. 50) "were either virgins" when called to the apostleship, "or had no more to do with their wives" subsequently to their vocation. "Bishops, priests and deacons are either chosen virgins or widowers, or at least remain continent after priesthood, as long as they live." Thus St Jerom; and, before him, St Cyril of Jerusalem argues in the manner following: (Cat. 12) "If he that bears well the priestly character in Christ, abstains from the use of matrimony; how could Christ himself derive his sacred birth from matrimony?" St Epiphanius observes (hæc. 59) that "the person who continues to live as a husband with his wife, although he have but one, is not admitted by the church to the order of deacon, priest, bishop or sub-deacon, unless he ceases to converse with her as a husband." Origen too, was of opinion "that none are fit to offer continual sacrifice to Christ, who have not consecrated themselves to perpetual chastity." (Hom. 23 in Numeros.) It would be endless to enumerate all the authorities of the fathers, and ancient ecclesiastic writers, attesting and recommending this venerable rule of primitive discipline and practice.

"But *is not marriage honorable in all?* In due circumstances it is; not in cases where marriage would be sinful, sacrilegious and null. Is marriage with a father or mother very honorable? But, did not St Paul exhort *every man to have his own wife, and every woman to have her own husband*, in order to avoid *fornication?* (1 Cor. vii. 2.) Yes; but the same apostle, in the very same chapter (v. 27) likewise says: *Art thou loosed from a wife? seek not a wife.* Why did Christ (Matt. xix. 12) exhort christians to a single life? Certainly, to dissuade them from

the *necessary* means of avoiding intemperance, was a thing altogether repugnant to his sanctity. Therefore, in the judgment of Christ himself, marriage is not the only preservative of virtue." See more upon the subject in Dr Hawarden's *Church of Christ*, whence the above remarks are taken; also in Milner's iii. Letter to Dr Sturges, or in any other catholic polemic who has undertaken to discuss this topic.

U

UNITARIANS. See ANTITRINITARIANS.

UNIVERSALISTS—are those that hold out universal salvation to all mankind indiscriminately, and even to the wicked spirits themselves—after undergoing a sharpish kind of purgatory in the other world. Their system certainly would appear highly charitable, were it not subversive of scripture doctrine and christian revelation. But, unfortunately, it has been long ago discarded in the universal church as equally inconsistent with both, and at a very early period of christianity anathematized as erroneous and heretical. Its votaries fail not to urge in favor of the scheme some specious arguments and ingenious conceits, well calculated to stagger the credulity of the ignorant and the weak in faith; but those that listen to the precepts of Jesus Christ, ordering them to hear the church, and to believe its pastors in the definition of doctrinal truths,—have a safer guide than human reason, even the Spirit of truth itself, to preserve them from pernicious errors.

Of Universalists there are various descriptions; but all agree in the leading, or rather the only *fundamental* doctrine of the sect, which is the final restoration of all without exception, even the fallen angels, to eternal happiness. The *Rellyan* Universalists, so called from a Mr Relly formerly a Calvinistic Methodist preacher, with the Quakers reject baptism, and will have nothing to do with ceremonial ordinances. They maintain, that no works are necessary, but the doing of good, and relieving the miseries and distresses of their fellow creatures—without regard to any particular religious injunction or revelation. Thus the author, after a variety of experiences or supposed convictions of the truth of his first religious creed—by a contradictory inspiration—exchanged the odious extreme of rigorism for the opposite, though more agreeable, extreme of anti-scriptural indulgence and good nature. Happy indeed;—thrice happy tidings for old

Lucifer and his sable adherents, were this new Evangelist's latter conceits more infallible than his former experiences !

UBIQUITARIANS, or UBIQUISTS—were Lutherans who maintained, that in consequence of the hypostatic union of the humanity of Christ with the Divinity, his sacred body must, of course, be every where together with his Divinity. The Sacramentarians held opinions widely different with relation to the eucharist ; the latter rejected the doctrine of the real presence, because they could not conceive—how a body should exist in divers places at the same time ; while the Ubiquitarians, on the contrary, attempted to demonstrate, that the humanity of Jesus Christ being united to the word, must necessarily be in all places together with the word. Melancthon rightly observed, that this idea tended to confound the two natures of Jesus Christ, as it implied—not only that his humanity, but that even his sacred body was immense ; and that it quite destroyed the *mystery* of the eucharist, by depriving it of whatever was peculiar to itself ; since in this hypothesis Jesus Christ, as man, would be equally present in a piece of wood, or in a stone.

W

WICKLIFFITES—the followers of John Wycliffe, a native of the village of that name in Yorkshire. In his theological lectures, his sermons, and his writings, he inveighed bitterly against the Roman pontiff, who had approved a sentence of the archbishop of Canterbury to his disadvantage. He repeated whatever had at any time been alleged against the pope's power or his riches, attacked his authority even in things purely spiritual, and pretended to recognise many fundamental errors in his doctrine. From the clergy he could expect no countenance. He therefore contested their privileges, and endeavoured to bring them into disrepute with the laity. There existed some abuses in the collation of benefices upon strangers, the undue interference of Trans-Alpine authority, and certain other grievances of smaller moment. These Wickliff hailed as favorable circumstances, which would greatly facilitate his darling project of severing England from the church of Rome. In this design he was seconded by the Lollards, who had acquired importance in our island, and now became zealous advocates and coadjutors of Wickliff in so laudable an enterprise. See their article.

The anarchy, the fanaticism, and the outrageous conduct of the Hussites and the Anabaptists were the natural result of

Wickliff's doctrine, which they imbibed from his irreligious, and not less seditious, writings. After declaiming immoderately against the popes—in some things, doubtless, very blameworthy, else they must have been more than men;—after falling foul upon religious orders, and descanting against the riches of the clergy, he proceeds to deny the efficacy of the sacraments. Confession, he says, is a useless ceremony; and, with transubstantiation he will have nothing to do. He renews the error of Berengarius, or rather of his disciples; and with them rejects the real presence of our Blessed Saviour in the eucharist. He will not allow the *extreme unction* to be a sacrament, and maintains that—whoever is in the state of mortal sin, has forfeited all right to any property whatever. Tithes, according to him, no man can in conscience pay to any wicked minister; over whom he establishes the laity themselves judges, and exhorts them not to stand in awe of ecclesiastic censures. A father who perseveres in justice until death, cannot, forsooth, transfer an inheritance to his son, unless he also merits for him the grace of living holily. Kings, and popes, and bishops, if guilty of a single mortal sin, are equally to be despoiled of all their rights and prerogatives. Prelates, he declares, have nothing but an *imaginary* jurisdiction over the rest of the faithful. All men are, in his ideas, on the level of perfect equality; and all ought to enjoy an equal participation in the blessings of nature. All this he repeats in his treatise *Of the Devil*, in his book *On Heaven*, and in that *Of Confession*. With Abelard, he teaches optimism, and fatalism with the Predestinarians and the first reformers; nor were his ideas of indulgences more orthodox, or his exceptions against praying for the dead.

Wickliff had a multitude of votaries in England; the clergy in order effectually to check the progress of his errors, repeatedly condemned his doctrine; and the university of Oxford having examined his writings, extracted from them two hundred and seventy-eight propositions, which it deemed worthy of ecclesiastic censure, and caused to be presented to the archbishop of Canterbury. From this collection we have borrowed the scanty summary of part of Wickliff's erroneous tenets, most of them adopted by the Hussites, Anabaptists, &c. Indeed, they were so well accommodated to the various inclinations of vast numbers of tepid christians at the time, and so favorable to the general spread of disaffection for the pope, the clerical body, and the religious, that it is not matter of surprise he should have had his followers. The clergy were not indifferent to their progress, and procured severe measures to be adopted against both Wickliffites and Lollards indiscriminately. They found, however, many powerful protectors; and the house of commons in 1404 presented an address to the king—praying him to make a seizure of the revenues of the clergy; with which unreasonable requisition he thought

not proper to comply. A similar address was repeated in 1410. It met with no encouragement; on the contrary, his majesty forbade the commons any more to interfere in clerical concerns, and when they afterwards demanded the revocation or *at least* a mitigation of the statute against the Wickliffites and the Lollards, he remained inflexible, and even caused a sectarist of the latter description to be executed while parliament was actually sitting. Henry V. was equally severe in regard of the Lollards, although he did not eventually succeed in compassing the destruction of that sect, or the suppression of the Wickliffites. They silently gained ground, and made many proselytes in the house of parliament itself; a circumstance which contributed not a little to prepare the way for the schism under Henry VIII. When the Hussites were put down, the impression which the doctrines of Wickliff had left upon the minds of the ignorant and the ill disposed, did not so easily wear out; and these doctrines produced the various sects of Anabaptists: who filled the provinces of Germany with desolation, when once the daring Luther had erected the standard of revolt against the catholic church.

The Wickliffian errors concerning the real presence of Christ in the eucharist, we have refuted under the article BERENGARIUS; his heterodox opinions regarding prayer for the dead, the ceremonies of the church, the sacrament of order, and the superiority of bishops, under that of Aërius; his system of optimism, under that of Abelard; his ideas of indulgences, under that immediately following. His exceptions against confession have been renewed by the Calvinists who pretend, that the obligation of confession originated only with the council of Lateran in 1215 under Innocent III. On the other hand a host of learned catholic divines have proved, that sacramental confession of sins—not only in general and in particular, but of sins, too, committed in secret as well as in public, was in practice at all times even from the very birth of christianity; that it is of divine institution, and strictly obligatory by divine right. (See Nat. Alex. cont. Dalleum. Sainte Marthe, traité de la Confession, &c. &c.) Among others the great Bossuet observes, that “the terms of the commission given to the ministers of the church, to absolve sinners, are so general, that it cannot without temerity be restricted to *public* crimes; and as in pronouncing absolution in the name of Jesus Christ, they apply only the express terms of this commission, Jesus Christ himself may with truth be said to pronounce the sentence, while those pass judgment whom he has appointed judges in this instance: and while the priest is exercising the outward ministry, it is in fact our invisible High Priest—that inwardly absolves the penitent. This sacred tribunal being, as it really is, so necessary a check upon licentiousness, so fertile a source of good counsel, a consolation so cheering to the truly

repenting and afflicted soul—when she hears—not a mere declaration in general terms—of pardon for her crimes, as is practised by some among the reformed ministers; but an effectual absolution pronounced in her favor in the name and by the authority of Jesus Christ, after a particular examination, and careful cognisance of her state;”—let not that Jewish question, formerly objected against our Lord himself,—*Who is this that even forgiveth sins?* (Luke vii. 49.) and—*Who can forgive sins, but God alone?* (Mark ii. 7.) have any weight with christians; for Christ has said: *whose sins you shall forgive they are forgiven unto them, and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained.* (John xx. 23.)

Wickliff's charitable wish to rid the clergy of their property was not a new conceit: the Albigenes who before him had ardently coveted their possessions, had found none more zealous supporters of the measure, than were certain usurers and some avaricious noblemen. These made a much worse use of their power and their riches than the clergy, in oppressing and tyrannizing over their vassals. We often hear repeated these threadbare declamations against ecclesiastics; but rarely, very rarely indeed, from the mouth of men of sense,—from the disinterested, the modest and the charitable. See on this point the article **WALDENSES.**

Z

ZUINGLIANS—adopted the tenets of one Zuinglius, curate from the year 1506 to 1531, first of Glaris, afterwards of a considerable borough in Switzerland. About the same time that Luther began to preach against indulgences in Germany, Zuinglius also, exerted his zeal in the same way among the Swiss. Like the former, he was scandalized at the abuses which he saw practised by some of the papal commissioners in the collection of alms. From the abuses committed by the collectors, he soon converted his attention to the indulgences themselves, which he condemned with no less vehemence than the German reformer; and, together with indulgences, Zuinglius rejected the veneration paid by the catholic church to the saints and angels,—monastic vows,—the celibacy of the clergy,—the mass,—the Lenten fast, &c.

The reform which Zuinglius introduced in Switzerland, soon became widely diffused. Many leading men of the new religion seconded his efforts—at Berne, at Basil, at Constance, and in other places. However, several of the Swiss cantons still remained attached to the catholic doctrine, and reprobated the innova-

tions adopted by their fellow cantons. Both parties were much incensed against each other; and at length they mutually proclaimed open war. Zuinglius at an early period of his evangelical career, had imitated Luther and many other godly reformers—by taking to himself, in despite of the then existing ecclesiastical law forbidding priests to marry, a rich and, we may suppose, a very accomplished widow lady to wife. His personal prowess was not very great; and he dreaded the idea of heading in person his new gospel proselytes to combat. Wherefore he neglected nothing which he deemed conducive to re-establish peace. A comet denounced to him his approaching fate; and he bitterly lamented his own too premature dissolution. March, however, he must—against the common enemy; and the doleful event deprived his followers of their great apostle. He fell in the field of glory in 1531. The catholics remained masters of the plain; till the contending parties wisely agreed to terminate the bloody contest—by allowing to each other the free exercise of their respective religion.

The doctrine of Zuinglius regarding clerical celibacy, and the veneration of the saints and angels, we have refuted under the article *VIGILANTIUS*; his denial of the real presence—under that of *BERENGARIUS*; his exceptions against the mass, and against indulgences—under that of Luther. The Lenten Fast—being only a point of ecclesiastic discipline—could afford no sufficient grounds for a separation from the catholic church. However, we may here be allowed to observe, that the ecclesiastical law ordaining the annual observation of this solemn fast, is on many accounts most venerable to christians: it is venerable for its antiquity; for the universality of its observance, and for its manifold spiritual advantages recognised even by protestant travellers—in the surprising and edifying change operated in the lives of all descriptions of people in catholic countries, during this holy season. (See Sir Edwin Sands, in his *Europæ Speculum*.) If we trace the religious observance of Lent through each preceding age from the present time, we find it clearly established in the councils and ecclesiastic writers of every century up to the very first, and that such monuments and vouchers in all parts of the church, evidently carry it as high as any monuments of the kind are extant; that is, to the time when the immediate disciples and successors of the apostles were living, and actually governed the chief sees. The name itself of *The Forty Day's Fast* of Lent was used by Origen, (hom. 10. in Levit. T. 1, ed. de la Rue) and by subsequent writers in every succeeding age;—a circumstance, which demonstrates it to have been understood by the christian community—of this fast before their time. With regard to the general practice and utility of fasting, in order to appease the Divine anger, and to obtain blessings from above, it is so strongly recommended in holy

scripture, and even by the example of Christ himself in the new law, who in his retirement into the desert fasted *forty days*; that it would be a gross insult to the understanding of our christian readers to instance a multitude of texts by way of proof.

Zuinglius wrote a book in support of his new doctrines, in which he employs the common-place arguments of all reformers; arguments and slanderous charges which have been a thousand times refuted, and a thousand times—with increased asperity—brought forward again, as if they never had been controverted at all by catholic polemics. In the confession of faith which Zuinglius addressed to Francis I. a little before his death, occurs the following curious specimen of the author's orthodoxy. Having previously reminded that prince, that it was his duty to cherish in his breast the pleasing hope of one day beholding the assembly of all the holy, and courageous, and virtuous personages that ever have adorned society from the commencement of the world, he proceeds: "There will you see the two Adams—the redeemed and the Redeemer; you shall there see an Abel and a Henoch; a Hercules, a Theseus; a Socrates, an Aristides, Antigonus," &c. &c. and for aught we know—a Bonaparte too! The good-natured Swiss would have heaven set wide open to the very papists themselves, were it not too plain a contradiction to his darling system of reform.

Before we conclude this last article in our Dictionary, it will not perhaps be deemed foreign to the subject, to examine a little more minutely into the grounds of protestant separation from the Roman catholic church. "The very best divines of the protestant communion allow—that no separation ought to have taken place, but on account of articles authentically established, and to the belief of which all christians are equally obliged. If then they allow also, as in fact they do, that in the Roman church all articles fundamentally necessary to salvation are retained and professed, it follows evidently, that the first reformers separated themselves from its communion without sufficient grounds," and were therefore schismatics.

"M. Daille, in a treatise entitled *Faith founded upon Scripture*, after exposing all the articles of faith held by the protestants at large, tells us;—*they are beyond all contestation*; that *the Roman church professes to believe them*; that *in reality the protestants do not hold all our opinions*, but that catholics hold all their articles of faith; consequently, all the principal articles of the christian religion. But though M. Daille had not granted thus much, the thing itself is manifest; and it is most notorious to the world, that Roman catholics actually do believe all those articles termed by protestants *fundamental*. Nor will it suffice to say—that we destroy these articles by interposing others contrary to them. For the same M. Daille, whose authority is alleged—not so much to convince protestants by the testimony of one of

their most learned ministers, as because what he says is in itself highly reasonable,—tells them what they ought to think of such kind of consequences, on the supposition that mischievous ones might be drawn from our doctrine. Writing to M. Monglat, he says: “ although the opinion of the Lutherans upon the eucharist, as well as that of Rome—according to us—infers the destruction of the humanity of Christ; yet this consequence cannot be imputed to them without calumny, since they formally disavow it.”

“ There is nothing more essential to the christian religion, than the reality of the human nature in Jesus Christ; and yet though the Lutherans hold a doctrine, from which is inferred the destruction of this capital verity, by consequences which the rest of the reformed judge evident; yet they have not scrupled to offer to communicate with them—because their opinion *has no poison in it*, as M. Daille tells us in his apology; (cap. 7.) and their national synod, held at Charenton, 1631, admits them *to the holy table*, upon this ground, *that they agree in the principal and fundamental points of religion*. It is then a certain maxim established among them, that they must not in these cases insist upon the consequences which may be drawn from a doctrine, but purely upon what He proposes and acknowledges, who teaches it.”

“ So that when they infer by consequences, which they pretend to draw from our doctrine, that we do not sufficiently acknowledge the sovereign glory which is due to God, nor the quality of Saviour and Mediator in Jesus Christ, nor the infinite value of his sacrifice, nor the superabundant plenitude of his merits; we may defend ourselves without difficulty from such consequences, by this short answer of M. Daille; and tell them that—the catholic church disavowing them, they cannot be imputed to her *without calumny*.”

“ But the catholic church, far from overthrowing the fundamental articles of faith, either directly or indirectly, on the contrary, establishes them after so solid and evident a manner, that no one can question her right understanding of them, without great injustice.”

Catholic doctrine upon religious worship.

“ To begin with that adoration which is due to God alone; the catholic church teaches us, that it consists principally in believing Him to be the Creator and Lord of all things, and in adhering to him with all the powers of our soul, by faith, hope and charity, as to Him who alone can render us happy—by the communication of an infinite good which is himself.”

“ This interior adoration, which we render to God in spirit

and truth, has its exterior marks ; the chief of which is Sacrifice. This cannot be offered to any but to God alone ; because a sacrifice is established to make a public acknowledgment, and a solemn protestation of God's sovereignty, and *our* absolute dependance.

“ The same church teaches us, that all *religious worship* ought to terminate in God, as its necessary end ; and that if the honour which she renders to the Blessed Virgin, and to the saints, may, in some sense, be called *religious*, it is merely by reason of its necessary relation to God.

“ But before we explain any farther—in what this honor consists, it will not be impertinent to take notice, how the gentlemen of the pretended reformation, constrained by the force of truth, begin to acknowledge, that the custom of praying to saints and honoring their relics, was established even in the fourth age of the church. Monsieur Daille grants thus much, in the book which he published against the tradition of the Latin church upon the object of religious worship ; and accuses St Basil, St Ambrose, St Jerom, St John Chrysostom, St Augustine, and many more of those famous lights of antiquity who lived in that age, and above all St Gregory Nazienzen, called *the divine* by excellence,—of having altered, in this point, the doctrine of the three foregoing ages. But it will not appear very likely, that M. Daille should understand the sentiments of the fathers of the first three ages, better than those who gathered, as we may say, the succession of their doctrine immediately after their deaths ; and this will be the less credible, because the fathers of the fourth age were so far from perceiving they introduced any novelty in that worship, that this minister, on the contrary, has quoted several express texts, by which he shews clearly, they pretended, in praying to saints, to follow the example of their predecessors. But, without any further examination, what might be the sentiments of the fathers of the three first ages, I will content myself with what M. Daille is pleased to grant, allowing us so many great men who taught the church in the fourth age. For though he has taken upon himself 1,200 years after their deaths, to give them, in derision, the name of a kind of sect,—calling them *Reliquarists*, that is to say, Relic-honourers ; yet, I hope, those of his communion will have more respect for these great men. They will not, at least, accuse them of falling into *idolatry*, by praying to saints and honouring their relics ; or of destroying that trust which christians ought to have in Jesus Christ ; and it is to be hoped that henceforward they will refrain from similar reproaches in *our* regard, when they consider they cannot do it without accusing at the same time these excellent men, for whose sanctity and learning they themselves profess a reverence, as well as we.” For a more satisfactory detail with reference to the invocation of saints and

the honoring of their relics, see the article VIGILANTIUS: on images, revert to that of ICONOCLASTS.

Justification.

“ The first authors of the reformation proposed this article as the principal of all the rest, and as the most essential cause of their separation. Of justification therefore, we believe, in the first place, that *our sins are freely forgiven us by the divine Mercy, for Jesus Christ's sake.* (Sess. 6. c. 9.) These are the express terms of the council of Trent, which adds, that *we are said to be justified gratis, because none of those acts which precede justification, whether they be faith or good works, can merit this grace.*

“ But, as the Scripture explains the *remission of sins* by sometimes telling us that *God covers them*, and sometimes, that *he takes them away, and blots them out by the grace of his Holy Spirit, which makes us new creatures*; we believe, that, to form a perfect idea of the justification of a sinner, we must join both these expressions together. For which reason we believe our sins not only to be *covered*, but also *entirely washed away* by the blood of Jesus Christ, and by the grace of regeneration. This is so far from obscuring or lessening that idea which we ought to have of the merit of this blood, that, on the contrary, it heightens and augments it.”

“ So that the justice of Jesus Christ is not only *imputed*, but *actually communicated* to the faithful, by the operation of the Holy Spirit; insomuch that they are not *reputed* only, but *rendered* just by his grace.

“ If that justice which is in us, were only such in the eyes of men, it would not be the work of the Holy Ghost; it is then—a justice, and that before God, since it is God himself who produces it in us, by infusing his charity in our hearts.

“ Nevertheless it is too true, that *the flesh rebels against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh*; and that *we all offend in many things.* (Gal. v. 17. Jam. iii. 2.) So that, though our justice be truly such, by the infusion of his charity; yet it is not perfect justice—because of the combat of concupiscence: insomuch that the continual sighings of a soul, penitent for her offences, are the most necessary duty of christian justice, which obliges us to humbly confess with St Augustine, that “our justice in this life consists rather in the remission of sin, than in the perfection of virtues.”

The merit of good works.

“ As to the merit of good works, the catholic church teaches us, that *eternal life ought to be proposed to the children of God,*

both as a grace which is mercifully promised to them by the mediation of our Lord Jesus Christ, and as a recompence which is faithfully rendered to their good works and merits, by virtue of this promise. These are the proper terms of the council of Trent. (Sess. 6. c. 16.) But lest human pride should flatter itself with an opinion of a presumptuous merit, the same council teaches us, that all the price and value of a christian's works proceeds from the sanctifying grace which is given us *gratis* in the name of Jesus Christ; and that it is an effect of the continual influence of this divine Head upon its members.

“ The precepts, exhortations, promises, threatenings and reproaches of the gospel shew clearly enough, we must work out our salvation by the co-operation of our wills with the grace of God assisting us; but it is one of our first principles, that the free-will can do nothing conducive to eternal happiness, but as it is moved and influenced by the Holy Ghost.”

“ So that the church knowing it is this Divine Spirit which works in us by his graces all the good we do, she is obliged to believe, that the good works of the faithful are very acceptable to God, and of great consideration before him; and it is just she should make use of the word *merit*—with all christian antiquity,—the better thus to denote the value, price, and dignity of those works, which we perform through grace. But as all their sanctity comes from God, who produces them in us, the same church adopts, in the council of Trent, these words of St Augustine, as a doctrine of catholic faith;—that *God crowns his own gifts in crowning the merits of his servants.*”

“ We beg of those who love truth and religious concord, that they would be pleased here to read the words of this council a little more at length, the more easily to divest themselves of those false impressions which have been given them, concerning our doctrine. *Although we see, say the fathers in this council, that holy writ has such an esteem for good works, that Jesus Christ himself there promises,—that a glass of cold water given to the poor shall not want its reward; and that the apostle testifies how a moment of light pain endured in this world, shall produce an eternal weight of glory; nevertheless, God forbid a christian should trust and glory in himself, and not in our Lord, whose bounty is so great to all men, that he will have those gifts which He bestows upon them, to be their merits.*” (Sess. 6. c. 16.)

“ This doctrine is diffused throughout the whole council; which teaches us, in another session, (Sess. 14, 8) that *we, who can do nothing of ourselves, can do all things with Him that strengthens us, in such sort that man has nothing of which he may glory, nor for which he may confide in himself; but all his confidence and glory is in Jesus Christ, in whom we live, in whom we merit, in whom we satisfy; bringing forth fruits worthy of penance, which draw their virtue from Him, and by Him are offered to his Father, and accepted by his Father through Him.*

Wherefore we ask all things, we hope all things, we render thanks for all things, through our Lord Jesus Christ. We confess aloud we are not acceptable to God but in and by Him; and we cannot comprehend why any other thought should be attributed to us. We so place all the hopes of our salvation in Him, that we daily make use of these words to God in the sacrifice: *Vouchsafe, O God, to grant to us sinners thy servants, who hope in the multitude of thy mercies, some part and society with the blessed apostles and martyrs—into whose number we beseech thee to be pleased to receive us, not looking upon our merits, but graciously pardoning us in the name of Jesus Christ our Lord.*"

"Will the church never be able to persuade her children, now become her adversaries, either by the exposition of her faith, or by the decisions of her councils, or by the prayers in her sacrifice,—that she believes she can have no life but in Jesus Christ, and that she has no hope but in Him! This hope is so firm, that it makes the children of God, who walk faithfully in his ways, find *a peace which surpasseth all understanding*, as the apostle assures us. (Phil. 4, 7.) But though this hope be stronger than the promises and menaces of the world, and sufficient to calm the troubles of our consciences; yet it does not wholly extinguish fear: for although we be assured God will never abandon us, if we do not forsake Him, yet we are never certain we shall not lose him by our own fault, in rejecting his inspirations. He has been pleased by this saving fear duly to moderate that confidence, which he has infused into his children; because, as St Augustine tells us, such is our infirmity in this place of temptation and dangers, that an absolute security would produce in us tepidity and pride; whereas this fear, which, according to the apostle's command, *makes us work out our salvation with trembling*, renders us more vigilant, and makes us rely with a more humble dependence upon Him, *who worketh in us by his grace, both to will, and to do, according to his good pleasure*, as the same St Paul expresses it." (Phil. 11, 12, 13.)

"Thus you see what is most necessary in the doctrine of justification; and our adversaries would be very unreasonable, should they persist in denying that this doctrine suffices to teach christians, that they are obliged to refer all the glory of their salvation to God through Jesus Christ."

"Let then our protestant brethren cease to accuse us of annulling the grace of God, by attributing all to our good works; since we have shewn them, in such clear terms of the council of Trent, these three points, so decisive as to this matter;—*That our sins are pardoned us out of pure mercy, for the sake of Jesus Christ; that we are indebted for that justice which is in us by the Holy Ghost—to a liberality gratuitously bestowed upon us; and that all the good works we do, are but so many gifts of his grace.*"

"And indeed we must acknowledge, that the learned of their

party do not contend so much of late about this subject, as they did formerly; and there are few but who now confess, there ought not to have been a breach upon this point. But if this important difficulty about justification, upon which their first authors laid all their stress, be not looked upon now as essential by the wisest and most learned persons of their communion, we leave them to think what they ought to judge of their separation, and what hopes there would be of a re-union, if they would but lay aside their prejudices and renounce the spirit of contention." See Bossuet's *Exposition of the Doctrine of the Catholic Church*; whence I have extracted the above reflections.

We will now beg leave to close our Dictionary with nearly the whole of the Reverend Joseph Berington's justly admired Introduction to his *Faith of Catholics*; as we conceive it well adapted to our plan, and highly appropriate in this stage of our compilation.

CONCLUSION.

"The creed or religious belief of catholics—is not confined, exclusively, to the scriptures: it is—what our Saviour taught, and his apostles delivered, before the sacred books of the New Testament had any existence. During the course of his mission, and after his resurrection, the apostles had been instructed by their divine master, fully and explicitly, we cannot doubt, in all things that it was necessary for them to know. To them *he shewed himself alive after his passion by many proofs, for forty days appearing to them, and speaking of the kingdom of God.* (Acts i. 3.) Then, giving to them his final commission, he distinctly said: *Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptising, &c. Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and behold I am with you all days even to the consummation of the world.* (Matt. xxviii. 19, 20.) The same commission is repeated: *Go ye into the whole world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth, and is baptised, shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be condemned.*" (Mark xvi. 15, 16.)

"Commenting on this commission, as stated by St Matthew, the learned St Jerom calls the form, in which it is delivered—the *ordo præcipuus*, or the leading rule; and then adds: "Christ commanded the apostles first—to *teach all nations*; in the second place—to baptise them in the sacrament of faith; and then, after faith and baptism,—to teach them what things were to be observed. And lest we should think that these things were of little moment, or few, he added: *all things whatsoever I have commanded*; that is, they who have believed, and have been baptised, shall be taught to observe *all my precepts*; and behold! *I am with you all days even to the end of the world.* This is his

promise: He will be with his disciples to the end of the world; thus shewing that they shall never die, and that he will never forsake them, that shall believe in him.”—Comment. in Matt. l. 4. in fine T. iii. p. 734.

“ Had Christ said: “ Go and commit to writing the gospel, or those saving truths which you have heard from my mouth; and let that writing or written word be the rule of belief to those whom you shall instruct, and to their successors to the end of the world”—had he said this, the point had been clear. But he said it not; he commands them to *go*, and to *teach*, or *preach*. The commission then is to *teach*; and obedience to that *teaching* is enjoined under the severest menace: *He that believeth not shall be condemned*; or, as you may have seen it rendered, *shall be damned*.” (κατακριθῆσεται.)

“ Under what latitude of interpretation can it now be maintained, that this positive ordinance of Christ was merely *temporary*?—That it was to cease, and be superseded by another rule when the apostles should be no more, and the writings which they might leave behind them should have been declared authentic, and have obtained a very general circulation? Were this to have been so; without any effort of the imagination, I might be allowed to represent to myself the apostle St John, who survived his brother apostles,—surrounded at Ephesus—as, we are told, he often was—by his disciples, thus addressing them: My dear children I have finished my gospel; written some epistles, as likewise the work which, from the various scenes therein described, I have entitled Apocalypse or Revelations. Three other gospels have been compiled; a narrative called Acts, made public; and my brothers Peter and Paul, James and Jude have addressed certain letters to the churches. I can speak to their truth and their authenticity. Now then, as my time of abiding with you is short—it is essential you should know that these writings are to be the future rule of belief to you, and to all the faithful to the end of the world—not that ordinance of *teaching*, which our master once delivered to us.”

“ Polycarp the venerable bishop of Smyrna, who was acquainted with many of the disciples of Christ, and particularly with St John, does not tell us that he was ever addressed in that manner. But it is said of him “ that he always taught what he had learned from the apostles.” And yet, surely, it was the duty of the evangelist *so* to have instructed his pupils, had he been aware that a new order of teaching and believing was thenceforth to prevail. It is admitted that the greatest part of the books of the New Testament was, at this time, coming into the general use of the christian churches. The moment then, was opportune and critical.”

“ We catholics, therefore, believe that our master Christ established a rule, which was to last as long as his religion should

endure ; and that, to give to that rule a security that should never fail, he promised to be with the apostles and their successors, *even to the consummation of the world*. We likewise think that the perpetuity of that faith, which Christ came down from heaven to establish, would have been ill provided for—rather, would not have been provided for at all—if that ordinance of teaching which during his life time and that of his apostles, was judged necessary, had been then suspended—when it began to be most wanted. He would thus have been with his apostles who could enforce, even by miracles, the truths which they had received from his lips—but would on this supposition have left their successors to the guidance of their own judgment ; or, which is the same thing, to the guidance of a rule which himself had not established, and that—on points, avowedly not within the competence of human reason.”

“ The apostles taught the truths which they had learned from Christ. *I have received of the Lord*, said St Paul (1 Cor. xi. 23) *that which I also delivered to you* : and again : *For I delivered to you first of all, which I also received ; how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures* : (Ibid. xv. 3.) This is the *ordo præcipuus*—the leading rule ; first to *receive*, and then *deliver*. He does not say that he learned it from the scriptures ; but that he had *received* it. And the same truths by the same mode of teaching, have continued to be delivered down to us by the pastors of the church, the successors of the apostles. The difference lies in this only ; that the interval between us and Jesus Christ—the fountain of every christian truth—is measured by eighteen centuries ; whereas the communication between that fountain and the apostles, and between these apostles and the next to them in succession, was immediate. But truth is not lost, nor altered, nor weakened by descent—when an unbroken chain of living witnesses provided with all necessary documents, proclaims its identity, and the promised assistance of Christ himself, gives security to their words : *I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world*.”

“ But *how* is Jesus Christ with the pastors of his church. How !!—Does it become a thinking christian to ask this question ?—*How* does the Divine Providence govern the world ?—*How*, after he had left the earth, could Christ, as he had promised, abide with his apostles ?—*How* were the writers of the scriptures inspired in the execution of their tasks ?

“ But, if the subject be duly considered, it should appear, that no particular interference of the Divine Spirit, in the government of the church, is, on ordinary occasions, necessary, to preserve its pastors from error. They deliver what they have received. To this all are witnesses : the decisions of councils are witnesses ; the faithful are witnesses ; all our liturgies and other forms of prayer are witnesses ; the catechisms and books

of public instruction are witnesses ; and the writings of all preceding teachers, joined to the admitted testimony of the scriptures, are witnesses. A barrier, in defence of the truths once received, is thus formed, which no subtlety can undermine ; no temerity surmount. Still we cannot doubt, that God, with paternal kindness, watches over the great work of his mercy, and interferes as he judges it expedient ; in the same manner as, it is believed, he guided the pens of the evangelists, though all of them, by other means, were in possession of the facts which they relate. “ For as much as many,” says St Luke, i. 1, 2, 3, “ have taken in hand to set forth in order, a narration of those things that have been accomplished amongst us ; according as they have delivered them unto us, who from the beginning were eye-witnesses and ministers of the word : it seemed good to me also, having diligently attained to all things from the beginning, to write to Thee in order, most excellent Theophilus.”

“ But here, I admit, a question may be very fairly proposed. —If the ordinance of *teaching*, delivered to the apostles, was designed to be perpetual—as has been said ;—of what use are the scriptures of the New Testament ?—As an *independent* rule of faith we conceive them to be of none, for this plain reason :—that, as all the truths which we believe to be divine, and which are the objects of our faith, came immediately from Christ, and were taught by the apostles before those scriptures were written—we are not at liberty to think that those truths would not have remained, to the end of the world pure and unaltered, had that primitive state of things continued ; that is, had it never seemed good to any of those apostolic men as it did to St Luke, to commit to writing what they had learned. He did it, he says, that Theophilus, to whom he writes, might know the verity of those words in which he had been instructed.” (v. 4.)

“ But though these scriptures are not to us a rule of faith, taken independently of the *teaching* authority of the pastors of the church, who are the successors of the apostles ; yet we venerate them as a sacred *deposit* bequeathed to us by the kindest of parents, containing truths of high moment, practical lessons of saving morality, and facts of history, relating to the life of our Saviour and the conduct of his disciples, eminently interesting and instructive. For this we are deeply grateful. Nor have I mentioned all the advantages to be derived from the scriptures. For they come forward with a powerful aid, to support by the evidence of their contents—the divine truth of the faith which we have received. So Theophilus, when he read that admirable narration which St Luke compiles for him, would be more and more confirmed in the *verity of those words, in which he had been instructed.*”

“ Really I cannot understand, under what security of conscience we could, unauthorised, choose that for a rule of belief,

which Christ did not appoint—and which, if expounded by private interpretation, must often lead into error;—and neglect that authority, which he so positively ordained to be our guide. “Go ye and teach all nations . . . teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you.” And yet, I believe, it has been said—not by any member, indeed, of the catholic church—that “the scriptures are the sole rule of faith, and reason their sole interpreter,” that is, that each one shall teach himself! St Paul allowed not this liberty to his Corinthian converts. He speaks to them of the gospel which he had *preached*; which they had *received*; and wherein they *stand*: and, by this, he adds, “you are saved,” if you hold fast after what manner I preached to you, unless you have believed in vain. (1 Cor. xv. 1, 2.) No choice is allowed: they must believe as he had taught them.”

“The catholic reader will now be sensible, should any point of his belief seem to receive but little support, or even no support, from any text of scripture,—that its truth is not thereby affected, as its divine origin from Christ, and its descent from the apostles, remain the same; and, therefore, that the doctrine of *Purgatory* and the *Invocation of Saints* stands on the same foundation as that of the *Authority* of the church, though, in support of the former, the evidence of scripture be comparatively weak. Why, or how this has happened, let him say, *who hath known the mind of the Lord, and hath been his counsellor.*” (Rom xi. 34.)

“But even where the proofs from scripture are most plain and most abundant, the well-taught catholic does not apply them definitively, as the light of his own understanding may direct him; but he turns to the guide that Christ appointed, that is, the *teaching* authority of the successors of the apostles; which guide will lead him through the paths of truth, by explaining—in what sense the passages of scripture on doctrinal points have, at all times, been understood, expounded, and applied. Such a guide is manifestly necessary when on those points—as it too often happens—the meaning of any passage has been made a subject of controversy. For, it needs not be said, how prone to error is the undirected mind of man; and that when he thinks that he follows the evidence of the written word—which must be to him a silent letter,—it is his own fancy that he follows, or the delusive light of a very fallible understanding.—Such a guide, says the catholic, can give me no security; while if I wish for subjects on which to exercise the powers of my mind—in which to err indeed, may be easy, but where error would be innocent—they present themselves on every side. On points avowedly above my reach, I wish to risk no decision, nor on collateral subjects connected with them: for errors in religion, I am told, have all arisen from the scriptures misunderstood, or have been maintained by alleged proofs derived from them.”

“ The security which a catholic, well-instructed, experiences in the profession of his belief, resting on the *teaching* authority established by Christ, must be esteemed a signal blessing. And what adds to it is, that the more he enquires, the more he finds that security confirmed, as he ascends, through the annals of time, towards Christ and his apostles: while the unlettered man, by a few plain documents, is taught, that the guides whom his Saviour has commanded him to follow, can lead him securely into all truths; and that, in trusting them, he trusts in God.”

“ I would ask the soundest reasoner—when I had obtained from him the concession, that it was important to believe the truths which Christ came from heaven to establish; and that, on the admission of those truths, as the same divine teacher had so positively declared, depended future happiness:—I would ask him, I say, were I at a loss by what means to come to the knowledge of those truths—what advice he would give me? Would he advise me to search the scriptures for them, and rely on my own sagacity for the discovery—when I added that, on less important subjects, my own judgment often deceived me; and that, in regard to the meaning of some leading points in the scriptures, there were as many (and as opposite) opinions as there were lines?—Or would he refer me to such a guide as has been described—the speaking authority of the catholic church—which could tell me, in what sense those scriptures, on the points in question, had, at all times, been expounded; and besides, could hold out to me a clue that should safely lead me, through the series of ages, up to the time when Christ himself taught, and the apostles—as he commanded—delivered the doctrines which they had received from him?”

“ What his advice would be, cannot be doubted. And I can as little doubt that he would proceed to assure me, that to rely on any other guide, or to oppose to it the guidance of “ private judgment” must obviously arise from the most inveterate prejudice, or from the wild conviction, that it mattered not what a man believed, when he chose a guide that could not direct him.”

“ I am then convinced, would the serious enquirer—laying aside every other motive, but what the evidence of common reason would present to him—decide impartially;—that he must embrace the catholic principle of a *teaching* authority, resting on the commission given by our Saviour to his apostles, and the concomitant promise of perpetual assistance. But is not this authority an overbearing control? Does it not infringe that liberty of conscience which each one—it is often said—enjoys, of choosing his own faith, and of professing what he has chosen?”

“ That man enjoys this liberty in regard to his fellow-man, I am ready to allow. To one another we are not accountable.

But is it so in regard of Heaven? When Christ said to his apostles:—*Go ye and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptised, shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be condemned* (Mark xvi.): when he pronounced this solemn threat; if Peter, with his usual promptness, had observed:—Master, shall this be? Shall that liberty be thus taken away, which every disciple should enjoy—of choosing his own faith, and of professing what he shall have thus chosen?—I leave it to the person who may be supposed to have made the objection, to say—what, probably, on the occasion, would have been the reply of Christ? I will suggest to him only—what on another occasion he did say to the same apostle: *Get thee behind me, Satan; thou art a scandal to me: because thou savourest not the things that are of God, but the things that are of men:*” (Matt. xvi. 23.)

“Notwithstanding what I have said of the authority of *teaching* pastors, succeeding to the apostles, and exercising their ministry in the propagation of the Divine truths, I am aware that we often speak of the written word, or the scriptures, as a rule of faith.—This has arisen from the great authority which those scriptures bear, as the inspired word of God, and as containing the chief points of christian belief. But that they are not to us, as I before expressed it, an *independent* rule, is manifest, when it is moreover observed, that not only do they owe their integrity to the vigilant care of the church; but that no passage in them, on doctrinal points, is ever explained in any other sense, than as that church in conformity with what she has received, explains them. Hence we lay it down as an introductory and certain principle; “That all that, and that only, is of catholic faith, which God has revealed, and the church proposes to our belief.”—“The catholic christian,” observes the learned bishop of Meaux, “forms not his faith by reading the scriptures: his faith is already formed before he begins to read: reading serves only to *confirm* what he already believes; that is, to confirm the doctrine which the church has delivered to him.”—*Conference avec M. Claude*, p. 330.

“The leading points of catholic faith we embrace—because Christ and his apostles taught them: but Christ and his apostles taught likewise other articles: to those, therefore, we alike submit. To act otherwise, would, surely, be absurd. They come down to us through the same series of receiving and delivering the scriptures confirming their truth, and the fathers in their writings witnessing the legitimacy of their descent. And shall human arrogance here interfere; and because it judges some points to accord better with its notions of truth than others, receive these and reject the others; receive the doctrines of original sin, of the Trinity, of the incarnation and of the atonement; and reject that of the corporeal presence in the eucharist? Or the

motive may be, that the scriptures, called in, without authority, to be the sole rule of belief, and arbitrarily expounded, shall seem to speak more distinctly on some points than on others.

“ It here seems expedient to notice a charge, often urged against catholics, that the *use of reason*, in the concern of religion, is forbidden to them.—That this should have been said by Deists, who reject all revelation; or by the followers of Socinus, to whose understandings no mysteries are acceptable; I can readily conceive. But I cannot conceive,—that it should be heard from men, who themselves believe, that the Divine Being has communicated his will to man, and that in the manifestation of that, may be, and are, not one, but various subjects, placed beyond the reach of human comprehension. For by admitting but one single point—let us say that of the incarnation of the second person—not, it is plain, from any evidence in the object, but on the single motive of its having been so revealed, they by this admit a principle on which the whole fabric of catholic belief is centred.

“ To make this more plain, let me ask you, who are ready to submit your reasoning powers to this limited suspension—*why you are a christian?* I am a christian you will answer: because, having maturely weighed the various arguments which prove the authenticity of the Jewish scriptures; dwelt on the prophecies therein contained; and looked forward to their fulfilment, I seemed to discover, in applying those prophecies to a personage who appeared among the Jews in the reign of Augustus Cesar—their probable completion. At the same time a general expectation among nations, and particularly in Judea, selected that period as the season of some great event. Fondly then, I contemplated the birth of that personage with its wonderful circumstances, his character, his conduct, his lessons of morality, his miracles, his sufferings, his death, his resurrection from the dead, and his glorious ascension into heaven—all recorded in the simple language of truth, by witnesses who could have no motive to deceive me. And these witnesses, with their associates in the same cause, afterwards, I found, all died attesting the truth of what they had heard and seen. The personage then, called Jesus Christ, who lived and died as is related, was manifestly, I concluded, the expected MESSIAH, in whom the ancient prophecies were fulfilled and who was sent by God to make known his further will to man. To his lessons I then submit, as to the voice from heaven: I embrace his law—whether it contain moral precepts, the obvious tendency of which I plainly see—or it contain mysterious doctrines which I cannot comprehend. In these the authority of the Teacher is the motive of my belief. Shall I, weak and limited as I am in all my powers, attempt to measure what may be infinite; or withhold my assent, because, having compared what is spiritual with what is earthly, I discover not

that analogy, or those relations on which my understanding can repose? The establishment of christianity is then to me a *fact*, to which, by no laborious process of reasoning, I have been conducted; and, being thus far advanced, if I demur, or hesitate to believe—from any such motives as have been mentioned,—that same reason which hitherto has been my guide will not fail to tell me, that, in so doing, I act not the part of a christian or of a philosopher:—I have said; *why I am a christian*.

“This reasoning, I admit, is accurately just: but I must be allowed to add, that it is my own and that of every catholic who, from considering the motives of credibility, as they are called, has been led to the belief of the *fact* of the christian dispensation. But does the exercise of his reasoning faculties terminate here? It does not; because, from the unhappy divisions of the christian world, he is compelled to go farther.

“I will now say; *why I am a catholic*. But, first, let me observe, that the distinction of catholic and christian, in their original acceptation, was a distinction without a difference. Now, however, it prevails; and has long prevailed to a certain extent, since as early as the fourth century a Spanish bishop, reasoning against the Novatians, who had separated themselves from the church, says: “Christian is my name; Catholic is my surname.” It served therefore to denote those, who adhered to and were members of, that great society which in the creed is called *The Catholic Church*.

“I am a catholic then, because I am a christian; and I reason in the following manner: 1. Having been conducted, as has been stated, to the threshold of divine faith, am I not bound to receive as undoubted truths, whatever God in his goodness has taught me by his Son, without demur and without wavering; not enquiring whether they accord with my own preconceived notions, or with the relations and analogies of things conceived in my mind?

2. “Would not such demur and wavering, and such enquiry, argue pride and a culpable want of confidence in that Being, whose wisdom, and power and goodness, and love for his creatures, we know to be without bounds?

3. “But how am I to learn what truths those are which God has revealed?

4. “Am I to learn them—for eighteen hundred years have now elapsed since first they were delivered—am I to learn them from those records, called the books of the New Testament, wherein are deposited many words and actions of our Saviour’s life and conversation, as likewise many rules of belief and practice—or may those truths be collected from any other source?

5. “To satisfy this difficulty, should I not enquire whether any *rule* has been prescribed, which it is my duty to follow, and by following which, I shall learn in perfect security the truths in

question; conscious that, without such rule to guide me, I must be liable, from the very character of mind, to fall into misconceptions and error?"

6. "I now turn to those scriptures, and, perusing them with respectful caution, I find that, in giving his last instructions to his apostles, Christ bids them *Go and teach* all nations, . . . *teaching* them to observe *all things whatsoever* he had commanded; and he promises to be with them *all days even to the end of the world*. (Matt. xxviii.) In the gospel of St Mark, c. xvi. I find the same injunction repeated, with the threat that he who believeth not the *gospel* which shall be *preached* to every creature, shall be condemned."

7. "This is the ordinance or rule which I sought: and by it, I plainly see, two things are established: first an *authority* which is to point out to me, by *teaching*, what I am to believe; and secondly a duty—if I will be saved—of listening to and obeying that *authority*."

8. "But I cannot discover that any command is given—of committing to writing what our Saviour had taught, nor any reference made to books that might be written: Go and teach—is the simple mandate: and as during the lives of the apostles there was no written word that could be a rule, under what new injunction is the rule of *teaching* set aside, and that of scripture-interpretation substituted?"

9. "The authority then of which I speak, was first lodged with the apostles to whom it was directly committed; but as they, in a few years, would be called away from their labors, and Christ promised that he would be with them to the end of the world, must not this promise include them and their *successors* in the ministry of the gospel?"

10. "Should it be restricted to the few years of the lives of the apostles, would Heaven, I humbly ask, have sufficiently provided for the perpetuity of that faith, the foundations of which had been laid at such a vast expence of supernatural means?"

11. "In the successors, then, of the apostles, I conclude, was to be lodged—when they were gone—the same authority of *teaching*; and to the faithful was to descend—under the same menace of condemnation—the duty of receiving what they should be thus taught."

12. "Still, this being allowed me, must it not be proved—in order to ascertain the genuine character of these *teachers*—that the line of their succession from the apostles, during eighteen hundred years, has not been broken; and moreover, that nothing at any time has been added to, or taken from that deposit of sacred truths, which was originally committed to the apostles?"

13. "Doubtless, this must be proved:—First, then, I look to the promise of Christ—that he would be with the pastors of

his church to the end of the world.—Secondly, I turn to the annals of history, in which is recorded the succession of those pastors—the object of my research—and I particularly select the succession of the bishops of Rome.—Thirdly, I institute a similar enquiry through a similar research, on the points of belief.”

14. “ The result of this investigation is—That a line of succession in that church may be traced distinctly and incontrovertibly ; and that whether I take the whole code of belief, or—which is more easily accomplished—select any one article ; state it as it is now publicly taught ; and pursue it through the popular books of instruction, and the writings of those who, in every age, have recorded its doctrine—I am, invariably, brought to one conclusion,—that the catholic belief of the nineteenth century, in no part differs from the belief of the early ages, that is, from the belief of the apostles.”

15. “ Here I rest in perfect security : my reason has led me to a guide, and to that guide I submit my judgment, on all those points which it has pleased God to reveal, and his church proposes to my belief.—I have said ; *why I am a catholic.*”

“ But let it not be imagined that, because the catholic bows in humble submission to the voice of the *teaching* authority, on such points, and so far, as Christ has commanded,—that his liberty, on other subjects, is abridged,—or that, on such subjects, he is not as free to reason, to discuss, to receive, or to reject, as the freest man can wish. So it was of old : *Of every tree of the garden thou mayst freely eat*, said the Lord to Adam : *but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it : for in the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die.* (Gen. ii.) Here was a restriction ; and shall the descendants of Adam think it much to be restrained—where the utmost licence of thought could lead them to no certain knowledge ? When our first parents did eat, we know who told them, that *their eyes should be opened*, and that *they should be as Gods, knowing good and evil.*—I was not aware, that the exercise of private judgment had been so early recommended.”

“ Under what misconception, now, has it been made a subject of reproach to catholics, that the *use of reason* is forbidden to them ? I have led the reader through a series of investigation, composed of fifteen members ; which investigation, it is plain, to be completed must be carried on to a much greater length. And every catholic, whose circumstances will allow it and whose capacity will bear him through, is invited to pursue a similar enquiry ; from which the avenues to his faith will be best secured, and himself be always ready to satisfy every one “that asketh a reason of that hope which is in him.”

“ Secondly. Much has been written on the use to be made of the fathers, and on their authority in deciding controverted

points of doctrine. Their use regards, chiefly,—their *testimony*; and may be considered as limited to their being *witnesses* to the doctrines which they had received.—What their characters may be as writers on general subjects, or what their style of composition, is foreign from my plan to consider.—I observe, when they speak of points of essential belief, that they uniformly hold the same language—the language of St Paul—declaring that—what they *received*—that they *deliver*. They give nothing new; speak of nothing new but error; and, to every attempt at innovation they as uniformly profess themselves hostile.”

“ The testimony, then, of these personages—not conspiring to the maintenance of any preconcerted system; often separated by distance of space and time; not speaking the same language—some being Greeks and others Latins—is irresistible. It is not their reputation for piety, for candour, nor for orthodoxy, that carries conviction to the mind of the reader—for the testimony of Tertullian, when a Montanist, to the fact of his having received such doctrines, is little less than before his defection—but the simple circumstance of united testimony.”

“ In the second and third centuries the authorities are less numerous, from the obvious reason that fewer works on religion were then written; or that—which to us is much the same—fewer have come down to our times. But it has often excited my surprise, that all our doctrines can even from them be so distinctly traced—when no opposition to their truth called for any direct testimony. On these occasions, however, that is, before the subtlety of error made it necessary to be more accurate, it was very natural, that teachers of the people and writers should be more loose and unguarded in their expressions. And so it was. St Jerom, I recollect, remarks—speaking of some fathers who wrote before the Arian controversy—that their words might not have been always accurate; and the same apology on other subjects has been made for Lactantius and other writers. They spoke without fear of being misunderstood; using such phrases as were in common use. But when that heresy and those arising from it—the errors of Nestorius and Eutyches—had made it necessary to adopt a language of more precision, writers of inferior talents and acquirements became more guarded and more correct.”

“ A man, of common candour, being aware of this, will know how to judge as he investigates the opinions of those early days. Before any controversy had arisen on a particular point of doctrine, he will not look for the same precision as after Arius and Nestorius had caused litigation; and he will be disposed to make allowances for the case.”

“ It may be expected” continues Mr Berington, “ that I shall claim this allowance on the subject of Christ’s presence in the eucharist; a point which, during the centuries of which I

am speaking, had experienced no contradiction : but I shall not ; —with such fulness and decision is the doctrine every where announced. Still, I will not deny, that a captious controvertist may, on this and other points, extract some few passages, not always so full and explicit,—which he may think himself at liberty to make use of, should the candour of his mind not incline him to compare passage with passage ; to explain what may seem ambiguous or loosely worded, by what is clear and precise ; and finally to decide—not from detached clauses but from the *united evidence* of those who, during the period of the century, wrote incidentally or purposely on the subject.”

“ Having mentioned the subject of the real presence, and observed—how full and decisive on it are the sentiments of the early fathers, I may be allowed, perhaps, to introduce the analogous declaration of the great innovator, Luther. He is defending his own opinion against those who—making use of the liberty which he had promulgated of expounding the scriptures by their own judgment—denied the real or corporeal presence.” “ That no one among the fathers,” he says, “ numerous as they are, should have spoken of the eucharist as these men do, is truly astonishing. Not one of them speaks thus : *There is only bread and wine ; or—the body and blood of Christ are not present.* And when we reflect how often the subject is treated and repeated by them, it ceases to be credible—it is not even possible—that, not so much as once, such words as these should have dropt from some of them. Surely, it was of moment that men should not be drawn into error. Still, they all speak with such precision, evincing that they entertained no doubt of the presence of the body and blood ! Had not this been their conviction, can it be imagined that, among so many, the negative opinion should not have been uttered on a single occasion ? On other points this was not the case. But our Sacramentarians, on the other hand, can proclaim only the negative or contrary opinion. These men, then, to say all in one word, have drawn their notions, neither from the scriptures, nor the fathers.”—*Defensio Verborum Cœnæ*, T. viii. p. 391. *Edit. Witenbergæ*, 1557.

“ These authorities so chained his mind, that no effort could release him. He blushes not to add : This I cannot nor am I willing to deny, that had any one, five years ago, been able to persuade me, that in the sacrament were only bread and wine, he would have laid me under great obligations to him. In the discussion of this point, studiously anxious, I laboured much : every nerve was stretched to extricate myself, if possible ; for I was clearly sensible, that nothing would have given so much pain to the Roman bishop.”—*Ibid.* p. 502. What will our friend Peter Plymley say to this ? For more upon the subject I would refer him to the article BERENGARIUS.

Mr Berington proceeds: " This extraordinary man (Luther) could shew some respect for the fathers, when their opinions served to strengthen his own; but when they differed, all respect ceased. Our Henry the VIII. had entered the lists with him, in defence of the sacrifice of the mass; the friar replied: To establish this sacrifice Henry has recourse at last to the words of the fathers.—Heaven well knows, that I care not if a thousand Austins, a thousand Cyprians, or a thousand others like them were against me. God cannot err and deceive; Austin and Cyprian, and all the vessels of election, might, and did err." —*Contra Regem. Angl. T. ii. p. 334.*

" This may pass with Luther: but the more humble man will ask—If the testimony of the fathers may be disregarded—by what other means shall that chain of evidence be supported, which, through the lapse of ages, unites, and has united, the successive generations of believers, in one faith—with Christ and his apostles? I adduce therefore with pleasure the testimony of two divines of the established church, whose least praise it was, that they professed themselves the disciples of this arrogant and inconsistent reformer."

" Dr Cave thus speaks: " In this are all protestant divines, with few exceptions, agreed—that the scripture is the first and only infallible rule of faith and morals: and that the next place is due to the fathers, as far as they accord with, and approve and confirm by their testimony, the truth contained in the scripture. We revere the fathers; not indeed as judges of the faith, but as witnesses, who deliver to us with fidelity what was, in every age, done and believed. They hand down to us the sacred deposite of faith; and clearly point out what, and when, heresies arose, and the article of faith which they opposed. The more ancient those witnesses, the stronger is their testimony, and our reliance on them the more firm. Thus did those champions of old, Tertulian, Augustine and others, proceed in their defence of the christian religion—unceasingly appealing to their forefathers;—and among them no one has treated this argument more successfully than Vincent of Lerins, in his *Commonitorium* against heretics."—*Ep. Apolog. in append. T. ii. Hist. Lit. p. 68. Oxonii, 1743.*

" The same is the language of Dr Mills, in his dedication of the works of St Cyril of Jerusalem to the Earl of Pembroke and Montgomery: " Although you do not allow, that the authority of the fathers is sufficiently strong to establish a new dogma of faith; yet it is usual with you to adduce them as witnesses of the faith once delivered to the saints, and as most faithful interpreters of the word of God. For since the many controversies, with which the church in our days is harassed, have arisen from the contending parties not admitting any certain rule whereby to interpret the scripture—different authors drawing

from the same words different, and absolutely contrary meanings—these contentions would be happily terminated, if that which was held by the church at all times, and in all or most places, were on both sides admitted as true, certain and indispensable.—And I myself have heard you reject—not without indignation—the scriptural interpretations adduced by the Arians and Socinians, for no other reason, than because they are most remote from the sense of the fathers.”

“ It is proper to add, that many of these fathers, to whose testimony we have recourse, were themselves bishops of the churches which the apostles had founded ; to which churches an appeal was always made against the heretics, in favour of the true doctrine. “ What the apostles taught,” observes Tertullian, “ that is, what Christ revealed to them, may best be learned from those churches which the apostles founded.” He then adds : “ all doctrine that agrees with the faith of those original and mother churches, is to be deemed true : all other is false ; not coming from the apostles, nor from Christ, nor from God.” This he repeats ; and the same—as will be remarked in the perusal of this book—is repeated by others. If then the authority of these churches be such ; such also, must be the authority of their teachers ; not only when they preached the doctrine which they had received, and their churches preserved ; but likewise, when they committed the same to writing, and attested its truth.”

“ Thirdly. The voice of general councils, in our opinion, is most decisive. They form, in a certain sense, the representative body of the universal church. Yet councils, whether general, or national, or provincial, proceed on the common principle that guides individually the pastors of the church. Having enquired on the controverted point that has assembled them together, by turning to the annals of former times—what was then taught, as confirmed by the scriptures and the testimony of the fathers ; and having declared what they themselves—the pastors of the faithful and the guardians of the deposit of faith—have received ; they pronounce that to be error, which is not conformable to the truth thus authenticated ; and by a new definition, if judged necessary, re-confirm this truth. To remove ambiguity, it may sometimes appear expedient to adopt a new term ; as was done at Nice when the word *Consubstantial* against the error of Arius was received into the Creed. But nothing new in the *doctrine* is thereby announced ; a more explicit profession alone is brought forward, or, as it has been well expressed, “ in consequence of the sophistries of error, a clearness and accuracy are adopted, which the contested articles while uncontested did not stand in need of.”

“ In councils then, is a greater solemnity, when the pastors of the church with united voice proclaim—what is the doctrine that hath been transmitted to them. This they did in the first gene-

ral synod, held at Nice against the errors of Arius ; and the same process was followed at Trent at a much more recent period—when the innovating spirit of the times called for a like interference. But—let me repeat it—the same principle, on all points of faith, directs the proceedings of councils, that is the guide to each individual prelate, in instructing the flock committed to his charge: *What I have received, that I deliver to you.—Discipline which is subject to the alterations of time and place, allows other modes of proceeding.”*

“ Fourthly. During the first eight centuries, there was not a shade of difference in the doctrines of the Greek and Latin churches : their sentiments were precisely the same on every individual article of faith. All were catholics ; and so—a few points excepted—have the Greeks continued down to the present day. In the ninth century the schism began, and has never since been completely closed ; the points of disunion, principally, being—the primacy of the Roman bishop over all the churches ; the addition made to the creed of Constantinople, usually called the Nicene creed, concerning the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son ; and the use of unleavened bread at the altar, by the Latins. The ambition of Photius, patriarch of the imperial city of Constantinople, first fomented the quarrel ; which much of the same spirit, I fear, has since upheld.”

“ Owing to this schism it has been, that many persons not attentive to dates, but attentive to the present difference of opinions, have incautiously fancied, that the Greek and Latin churches at no time thought alike ; and that the points on which they differ are many, and not the few which I have mentioned. To obviate this mistake on the first head, it is necessary to notice, as we pass from century to century in our course of reading, and from father to father—with what uniformity they utter the same sentiments, whether members of the Greek, or of the Latin rite.”

“ This unity of belief, so observable in the early centuries—which must be viewed as an essential mark of the church of Christ—as it rests on the immutable nature of truth, and is secured in its perpetuity by the means so often stated, must—if we reasoned only from moral probabilities—ever continue. The public mind, it will be admitted, has been often agitated, and often divided by discordant *opinions*, arising from the disputes of theologians on a variety of subjects ; though oftener such disputes—at least amongst us in the West—gained not the ear of the multitude. As far as it went, this was an evil ; but it is an evil inseparable from that liberty of thought and speech, which cannot be restrained. But, in the heat of the warmest altercations, no discordance was, at any time, discoverable, on the points of general belief, and the authority connected with them. This fact is deserving of notice, and must appear more so, when—through the progress of thirteen centuries—which followed the

times of which I have spoken—we contemplate the earlier events only—that is, the state of the European kingdoms, invaded and occupied by barbarous nations; the monuments of ancient days, in literature and in arts, destroyed; the venerable language of Rome merging in foreign dialects; and—but the picture by too many writers is too deeply coloured—the whole face of the moral world more or less disfigured by ignorance, superstition and indiscriminating credulity. In the last, from the wider spread of heresies, and the portentous conquests of Mahomet and his followers, the case was worse. Yet the faith of the Jeroms and the Chrysostoms was not affected: the number of its professors was curtailed; but—wherever that faith was, there it was—one and entire. Surely the hand of that Being, who promised to be with his church to the end of the world, is in this visible; protecting and upholding, what I called the work of his mercy.”

“ To the other moral causes of the perpetuity of faith, must likewise be added, in the West, the vigilant superintendence of the Roman bishop; which vigilance, as in the darker ages it became more necessary, was more active; while his chair—with which all churches held an intercourse—served throughout as a centre of union to all.—Let me also add, as another preservative of unity in faith, the continued prevalence of the Latin language in the public service of the church. The culture of this language, and also that of Greece, while it prepared the christian minister for the discharge of his public functions, preserved them both from extinction; tended to give some relish for the learning of former days, and with it an anxiety not to let perish the choicest monuments of that learning; and, should a better era arise, it would be at hand to aid the reviving cause of letters.”

“ The sum of these observations, which I am compelled to close, may be comprised in a few words.—We believe that all the points of catholic faith exclusively, as likewise such other points as are common to us and other christian societies, were originally taught by Christ, and by him communicated to his apostles, to whom he gave a commission to go and *teach* the same to all nations; promising, at the same time, that he would be with them to the end of the world. This body of Divine truths those apostles, we believe, delivered—pure and unaltered, as they had received them—to the nations which they converted; and—to those men particularly, whom they appointed to be their successors in the ministry. The form of teaching, ordained by Christ, was thus established. But, as daily, in the progress of time—let us say, by the end of the first century—men began to recede further from the days of Christ and his apostles, a necessity arose, that every preacher of the christian doctrine should prove to his hearers, that the points which he delivered as divine truths, were really such; that is, were those which Christ

and his apostles had taught. His own word, it is plain, could not here suffice. He had recourse, therefore, to the aid of *testimony*:—to the testimony of those who had conversed with the apostles, and had been instructed by them, could any such be found; or to such documents as they might have left: and he had recourse with peculiar confidence to those writings which now began to be circulated, and were received as authentic in the churches. These writings we call the books of the *New Testament*, which were then carefully preserved; and, in their integrity, have been transmitted down to us.”

“ Thus is the use of these scriptures at once made manifest; and, as time goes on, their use in the same sense, remains; while to them as an additional *testimony*, continue to be super-added the works of the fathers. These attest, century after century, what are the points of faith which were *received*, and were *delivered*. Through this channel, then, as St Paul expresses it, of *receiving* and *delivering*, all the truths taught by our Saviour Christ, are transmitted to us in an uninterrupted series by the pastors of the church; which truths the scriptures confirm, while the writings of the fathers accompany and attest the legitimacy of their descent.”

“ The following passage from Bossuet will not be foreign from our purpose. Reasoning with the Calvinistic minister Claude in a beautiful strain of eloquence, he thus proceeds:—
“ There was no time when a visible and speaking authority did not exist, to which submission was due. Before Jesus Christ, that authority, among the Jews, was in the synagogue; when the synagogue was on the point of failing, Jesus Christ himself appeared: when this divine personage withdrew, he left a church, and with it his Holy Spirit. Tell me, that Jesus Christ once more appears upon the earth teaching, preaching and working miracles; I want this church no longer. But if you take her from me, again I must have Jesus Christ in person, speaking, instructing, and deciding by miracles, and with an unerring authority. But has he not left, you say, his written word? He has: a word holy and adorable; but it is a word that may be handled and expounded as fancy shall direct; a word that remains silent under every interpretation. When difficulties and doubts arise, then I must have some external guide that shall solve those difficulties, and satisfy my doubts; and that guide must be unerring.” *Conference avec M. Claude*, p. 129.

“ I will close with the character of a catholic, as drawn in the fifth century by Vincent of Lerins:—“ He is a true and genuine catholic, who loves the truth of God, his church and its members; who to his religion and his faith prefers nothing—not the authority of any man—not wit, not eloquence, not philosophy; but who looking down upon these things with in-

difference, and firmly fixed in his belief resolves to admit and to adhere to that only, which from ancient times he knows to have been universally received." Commonit. c. xx. p. 346.

In necessariis unitas, in dubiis libertas, in omnibus charitas.

By this golden rule, the intelligent reader will be enabled to appreciate the principles of the discordant sects enumerated in this Dictionary: and the Editor himself is willing to submit to its correction—whatever he may have incautiously advanced—not reconcilable with its genuine spirit. If he has, in any instance, exceeded the boundaries of charitable animadversion—where the erroneous maxims of fellow-christians seemed to him to require unqualified disapprobation, he begs permission to disavow, on such occasions, all personal hostility, and all intentional endeavours unnecessarily to wound their feelings.

ERRATA.

Read—Edinburgh, *instead of* British, Encyclopedia, art. CULDEES.
Wittenburg, *instead of* Wirtemberg, art. LUTHER, &c.

NEWCASTLE: PRINTED BY EDW. WALKER, PILGRIM-STREET.

YC150446

